DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 946 HE 026 008

AUTHOR	Tehranian, Majid, Ed.
TITLE	Restructuring for Ethnic Peace: A Public Debate at the University of Hawaii.
INSTITUTION	Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. Spark M. Matsunaga Inst. for Peace.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-880309-03-3
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	197p.; Based on a series of public forums (Honolulu, HI, Spring, 1991).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Books (010)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Freedom; *Affirmative Action; College School Cooperation; College Students; *Colonialism; *Ethnic Discrimination; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Relations; Group Discussion; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Peace; Racial Relations; School Role; Sexual Harassment; Social Action
IDENTIFIERS	*Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This volume represents the outcome of a series of seven public forums held at the University of Hawaii on problems of ethnic peace. The papers included cover such topics as academic freedom and responsibility; affirmative action and grievances; legacies of colonialism and racism; dynamics of class, ethnicity, culture, and education; and finally the search for ethnic peace in Hawaii. Panelist presentations are as follows: "Remarks on the Limits of Academic Freedom" (Kenneth Kipnis); "The Politics of Academic Freedom as the Politics of White Racism" (Haunani-Kay Trask); "Discursive Politics" (Kathy E. Ferguson); "The Responsibilities of the Academic" (Peter Manicas); "Native Hawaiian Students and the Role of the University" (Kaleimomi'olani Decker); "Sexual Harassment and the University's Responsibility" (Susan Hippensteele); "The University's Attitude Toward Students" (Robert Wisotzkey); "The Legacy of Racism and the Role of the University" (Manfred Henningsen); "'Which Side Are You On?'" (David E. Stannard); "The Politics of Survival" (Kathryn Waddell Takara); "The Invalidity of the Concept of 'Race'" (Emanuel J. Drechsel); "The Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University - A Native Hawaiian Point of View" (Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa); "A Journey into the Mind and Body of a Colonial Institution" (Farideh Farhi); "To Challenge Colonial Structures and Preserve the Integrity of Place: The Unique Potential Role of the University" (Noel Kent); "Colonialism at the University of Hawaii: The Experience of a Pacific Island Student" (David Welchman Gegeo); "Academic Freedom" (Majid Tehranian); "The University's Responsibility toward Students" (Mary Tiles); "Racism and the University: The Search for Ethnic Peace" (Franklin S. Odo); "The Search for Ethnic Peace in Hawaii" (Donald M. Topping); "A Native Hawaiian Basis for University Restructuring" (Alohilani Kuala); "Perspectives on Racism" (Steven Ito); "Immigrants and Racism" (Sheila Forman); "Baha'i Faith and Ethnic Peace" (Fariba Piroozmandi); and "Restructuring for Ethnic Peace at the University of Hawaii" (Luciano Minerbi). The report also includes roundtable reports from a forum on class, ethnic identity, culture, and education in Hawaii. Appendices include documents to assist in understanding references made in the papers to specific people and events on the University of Hawaii campus. (References accompany some papers.)(GLR)

ED351946

RESTRUCTURING FOR ETHNIC PEACE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Matsunaga Inst. for Peace U of HI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Public Document at the University of Hawai'i

HE 026 008

EDITED BY MAJID TEHRANIAN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Restructuring for Ethnic Peace:
A Public Debate at the University of Hawai'i

Maluna a'e o nā lāhui apau ke ola ke kanaka
"Above all nations is humanity"

The Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace of the University of Hawai'i is an academic community designed to develop and share knowledge about the root causes of violence, the conditions of peace, and the use of nonviolent means for resolving conflicts. Founded in 1985, the institute operates with openness to all views and with a commitment to academic freedom and rigor. It is committed to improving education in peace studies for graduate, undergraduate, secondary, and primary school students; undertaking peace research to promote understanding of issues of violence, nonviolence, social justice, ecological vitality, freedom, and human dignity; participating with community groups to communicate with all segments of our society on these issues; and publishing scholarly and creative works on peace in all media.

Restructuring for Ethnic Peace:

A Public Debate at the University of Hawai'i

Edited by
MAJID TEHRANIAN

Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace
University of Hawai'i
Honolulu, Hawai'i
1991

Copyright © 1991 Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace

Except for

"Sexual Harassment and the University's Responsibility"
by Susan Hippensteele
Copyright © 1991 Susan Hippensteele

"The Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University:
A Native Hawaiian Point of View"
by Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa
Copyright © 1991 by Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa

"Introduction" to Forum 4 and "Racism and the University:
The Search for Ethnic Peace" by Franklin Odo
Copyright © 1991 Franklin Odo

"The Politics of Academic Freedom as the Politics of White
Racism," by Haunani-Kay Trask
Copyright © 1991 Haunani-Kay Trask

We are grateful to Kersten Johnson for permission to use
the cover design "Hands," based on a logo designed and
copyrighted by Dr. Johnson for the
Participatory Development Project
Institute for Economic Development and Policy
East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawai'i

ISBN 1-880309-03-3
Manufactured in the USA

CONTENTS

Preface *ix*

Forum 1:
The University and the Right of Academic Freedom 1

Introduction
Majid Tehranian 2

Remarks on the Limits of Academic Freedom
Kenneth Kipnis 4

The Politics of Academic Freedom as the Politics of White Racism
Haunani-Kay Trask 11

Discursive Politics
Kathy E. Ferguson 23

The Responsibilities of the Academic
Peter Manicas 28

Forum 2:
The University's Responsibility Toward Students 35

Introduction
Mary Tiles 36

Native Hawaiian Students and the Role of the University
Kaleimomi'olani Decker 38

Sexual Harassment and the University's Responsibility
Susan Hippensteele 41

The University's Attitude Toward Students
Robert Wisotzkey 46

Forum 3:
UH Policy and Procedure: Affirmative Action and Grievances 51

Panel Report
Barbara Siegel, Doris Ching, LaRene Despain, Nancy Lewis, Anita Liu, Mimi Sharma, and Mie Watanabe 52

Forum 4:
The Legacy of Racism and the Role of the University 65

Introduction
Franklin S. Odo 66

The Legacy of Racism and the Role of the University
Manfred Henningsen 70

"Which Side Are You On"
David E. Stannard 76

The Politics of Survival
Kathryn Waddell Takara 85

The Invalidity of the Concept of "Race"
Emanuel J. Drechsel 92

Forum 5:
The Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University 99

Introduction
Donald M. Topping 100

The Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University--
A Native Hawaiian Point of View
Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa 102

A Journey into the Mind and Body of a Colonial Institution
Farideh Farhi 110

To Challenge Colonial Structures and Preserve the Integrity
of Place: The Unique Potential Role of the University
Noel Kent 118

Colonialism at the University of Hawai'i: The Experience
of a Pacific Island Student
David Welchman Gegeo 123

Forum 6:
Class, Ethnic Identity, Culture, and Education in Hawai'i 129

Introduction
Ron Cambra 130

Roundtable Reports
James Harpstrite, Wally Ryan Kuroiwa,
Jon Matsuoka, Davianna McGregor, and
Charlene Sato 131

Forum 7:
The Search for Ethnic Peace in Hawai'i 139

Academic Freedom
Majid Tehranian 140

The University's Responsibility Toward Students
Mary Tiles 145

Racism and the University: The Search for Ethnic Peace
Franklin S. Odo 147

The Search for Ethnic Peace in Hawai'i
Donald M. Topping 151

A Native Hawaiian Basis for University Restructuring
'Alohilani Kuala 155

Perspectives on Racism
Steven Ito 159

Immigrants and Racism
Sheila Forman 161

Baha'i Faith and Ethnic Peace
Fariba Piroozmandi 162

Restructuring for Ethnic Peace at the University of Hawai'i
Luciano Minerbi 163

Appendixes
1. A Chronology of Events 173
2. Original Documents 175
3. Print Media References 181

Forum Participants 185

Publications of the Matsunaga Institute 187

PREFACE

In the academic year 1990-91, the Matsunaga Institute for Peace at the University of Hawai'i was faced with a dual challenge, how to respond to the Gulf War in the Middle East and to the ethnic conflict on our own campus. Neither of these conflicts lent itself to an easy solution, but each demanded a greater understanding of the underlying causes. Both pointed to an emerging phenomenon. With the decline of the Cold War and its universalist ideological pretensions, ethnicity and nationalism have once again taken the center stage in domestic and international conflicts throughout the world. Both suggested a compelling lesson: there will be no peace without rendering justice to the disenfranchised and oppressed ethnic groups in the world.

As a peacemaking educational institution, our response was designed to bring more light than heat to the two situations. Scholars and practitioners of conflict resolution have long come to recognize that human conflict cannot be avoided, but it can be usefully regulated, managed, and resolved in such a way as to avoid or minimize manifest or latent violence. Acknowledging emotions, allowing them to come to the surface, articulating them in reasonable terms mutually understood and respected by the parties to a dispute, are necessary and preliminary steps to any resolution of conflicts. Debate and controversy can serve to bring out long repressed emotions, empower the oppressed to articulate their grievances publicly, and enable the oppressors and bystanders to recognize the grievous consequences of their own actions or inactions. Public forums can thus serve vital educational as well as conflict management purposes. The series of colloquia, seminars, workshops, and conferences held by the Peace Institute during 1990-91 on the two conflicts seem to have resulted in bringing about such a shock of recognition.

This particular volume is the outcome of a series of seven public forums held in the spring of 1991 on problems of ethnic peace at the University of Hawai'i. The forums were organized in response to an outbreak of ethnic tensions on the Mānoa campus as well as on most other American campuses, as witnessed by Dinesh D'Souza's best-seller, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*, and the cover story in the July 8, 1991, issue of

Time. While the debate between the Philosophy Department and the Center for Hawaiian Studies was the immediate focus of ethnic dispute on the Mānoa campus, the series went beyond it to focus on some of the root causes of ethnic conflict at the university. The forums covered a wide range of topics from academic freedom and responsibility, to affirmative action and grievances, the legacies of colonialism and racism, the dynamics of class, ethnicity, culture, and education, and finally the search for ethnic peace in Hawai'i. They engaged a total of some forty students and faculty as participants on the panels and received considerable public and media attention. The sessions were attended by hundreds of students and faculty, videotaped, and cablecast on Channel 20. The discussions were open, honest, and intense, often continuing well into the night.

The series managed to break through the unspoken taboo on public discussions of ethnic problems on the campus. Given the delicate ethnic balance in Hawaii, this taboo is understandable but not always conducive to interethnic understanding and conflict resolution. The series also paved the way for phases two and three of the "ethnic peace" series, which will carry the discussions into the larger community by focusing on statewide and worldwide ethnic problems. A statewide conference will focus on "The Search for Ethnic Peace and Justice in Hawaii: A Town-Gown-Robe Dialogue." It will bring together representatives from civic organizations, academic departments, and social service agencies dealing with problems of ethnic conflict. The worldwide conference will focus on "Ethnicity and the New World Order" and will bring together scholars from other parts of the world in which ethnic conflicts have flared up in recent years. In this fashion, the Peace Institute hopes to contribute to a more enlightened discussion of ethnic conflict and harmony, imparting the lessons of Hawai'i and learning lessons from other parts of the world.

Hawai'i, of course, has its own unique circumstances. The latest census statistics show that all ethnic groups continue to be a minority in Hawai'i. Due to faster birthrates and immigration, certain groups, notably native Hawaiians and Filipinos, are gaining in numbers. The same two ethnic groups are clearly the most economically and socially disadvantaged. The native Hawaiians have also legitimate claims as the indigenous people of Hawai'i. Two lessons seem to flow from these facts. First, Hawai'i is a multiethnic society in which no ethnic group can dictate to any

other(s). With a population mix of 33 percent European-American, 22 percent Japanese-American, 15 percent Filipino-American, 12 percent Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian, 6 percent Chinese-American, 2 percent African-American, and 10 percent others (mostly Americans of Pacific Island origins), Hawai'i can become a model for ethnic harmony for the rest of the world. Second, to be so, Hawai'i must look for ways of redressing the legitimate grievances of the disadvantaged groups.

The publication of this volume would have been impossible without broad participation by panelists who gave of their valuable time, energy, and intellectual resources in preparing oral as well as written presentations. Under the leadership of Manfred Henningsen and Emanuel Drechsel, the Symposium Committee of the institute took the initiative in the organization of the series. Rhoda Miller, the institute's associate director, together with the institute staff ably arranged the meetings and the publicity. At the recommendation of the Rev. Steven Ito, the Hawai'i Conference of the United Church of Christ provided funds to the institute towards the publication of this volume as well as the production of videotapes of the forums, currently available at the institute's resource center. Stanley Schab, the institute editor, successfully pursued the panelists for a few months for the submission of their papers. I wish to thank all of the participants in this project for their generous support and good cheer. Clearly, we cannot accept responsibility for all of the views expressed in the following pages. However, towards a better understanding of the problems of interethnic conflict and harmony, we are happy to present them for the consideration of a wider audience. This volume may enlighten or infuriate you, but it will not bore you.

Majid Tehranian, Director
Matsunaga Institute for Peace
August 1991

FORUM 1

The University and the Right of Academic Freedom

February 7, 1991

MODERATOR

Majid Tehranian

PANELISTS

Kathy E. Ferguson
Kenneth Kipnis
Peter Manicas
Haunani-Kay Trask

Introduction

MAJID TEHRANIAN

ALOHA! WELCOME to the first in a series of seven forums on "The University and Ethnic Peace." I am Majid Tehranian, director of the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace. Before we begin, may I request a moment of silent prayer for peace in the Gulf and here at home.

As you enter the Mānoa campus on the corner of University Avenue and Dole Street, there is a motto carved on the gate that is fading with time but I hope not in our consciousness. Please pay attention to it the next time you pass by that area. With apologies to my Hawaiian friends for my poor pronunciation, it reads: *Maluna a'e o nā lāhui a pau ke ola ke kanaka!* Above all nations is humanity!

We have adopted this motto for the Matsunaga Institute for Peace. A few years ago, I also tried rather unsuccessfully to have the university adopt this motto on its letterhead. The motto best represents the spirit with which the Peace Institute has initiated this series of forums. Instead of talking to the gallery, to the media, we hope that the series will provide the university community with an opportunity to enter into a serious dialogue on the root causes of ethnic conflict on the campus and ways of making genuine peace.

The Peace Institute has planned these forums as the first in a series of three events on problems of ethnic conflict and peace at the university, in the State of Hawai'i, and in the world. We hope to hold the next two events during the following academic year, in the form of a state conference in the fall of 1991 and an international conference in the spring of 1992. In planning this first phase, we made an offer to a number of colleges, schools, and departments at the university to cosponsor it with us. We are most grateful that the School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies as well as the Department of Educational Foundations responded positively. On behalf of the Peace Institute, I also wish to take this opportunity to sincerely thank all of the panelists who have responded positively to our invitation to participate. I particularly want to thank the

Symposium Committee of the institute, Professors Manfred Henningsen and Emanuel Drechsel, who along with Dr. Rhoda Miller and myself spent endless hours negotiating the program, the topics, and the procedures. I also want to thank Rev. Steve Ito and the campus ministry of the United Church of Christ, which has kindly offered to contribute toward the publication of the proceedings of this series. All panelists are requested to submit a ten-page paper for publication in the proceedings.

As the first in the series, we are here tonight to listen with open minds and hearts to four distinguished colleagues on the subject of the Right of Academic Freedom. The panel next week will be on the University's Responsibility towards Students, including a group of student panelists. Before I introduce tonight's speakers, let me state the ground rules to which they have kindly agreed. Each panelist will take up about twenty minutes or less to present her or his views. We will then immediately turn to you for your questions or comments. However, in the interest of maximizing your participation, we have to be rather stingy with time. Each speaker will have one minute to state a question or a comment. We request that if you wish to speak, kindly cue up behind the microphone. Following each speaker from the audience, the panelists also will have one minute each to respond. In responding, we will go in the same order as the panelists have spoken. My colleague, Dr. Rhoda Miller, will keep time from the floor, telling us when to stop with her waving sign. You better heed her or you will live to regret it!

Now to the introductions--in the order of their presentations: Professor Kenneth Kipnis, Professor Haunani-Kay Trask, Professor Kathy Ferguson, and Professor Peter Manicas.

Remarks on the Limits of Academic Freedom

KENNETH KIPNIS

I WANT to thank the Spark M. Matsunaga Peace Institute for having made this forum possible. It isn't often that faculty and students gather to enquire about ethical issues that are central to our understandings of ourselves as members of a common university community. I am grateful for the opportunity to participate here.

Before I begin, I should make it clear, first, that in these remarks I speak only for myself. While I am in some respects representative of faculty in the Philosophy Department, I do not claim to represent that department in any way. Accordingly, none of the opinions that I express should be imputed to any others in the Philosophy Department or to the Department as a whole.

Additionally, I want to mention at the outset the professional respect that I have had for Professor Haunani-Kay Trask. We have known each other for some years, have worked together, and I have appreciated her warm collegiality. I believe that the University of Hawaii, in several important respects, is a better place for having faculty like her.

At the same time, I cannot conceal what I take to be profound disagreement on certain issues that separate us, issues that involve the special privileges and responsibilities that attach to the role of academician, issues that I hope will be the focus of our discussion. I want to make it clear that my differences with Professor Trask are professional and not personal.

In order better to isolate those differences, let me spend a moment reviewing some of the topics that, in this context, it is not fruitful to address. For I expect that there are no significant disagreements between us as regards these matters.

1. I do not wish to take issue with any of the positions Professor Trask has expressed with regard to Hawaiian history. I am ready to accept that Caucasians have acted badly in the context of

that history, that the Hawaiian language has been wrongfully suppressed, that Hawaiians have suffered and continue to suffer as a consequence of that history, and that measures should be taken in the political arena to acknowledge and redress those grievances. However important these matters are, they are not pertinent to our discussion here. For no matter how shameful and injurious the wrongs committed by Caucasians, no matter how pure the chronicled innocence of Hawaiians, these historical facts are irrelevant to the general question of how professors and program administrators ought to treat other members of the university community.

2. I am also ready to accept that Haunani-Kay Trask has every right, as a personal matter, to her outrage at aspects of that history. As one whose ancestors, as Russian and Polish Jews, were the victims of deliberate attempts at repression and genocide, I can understand anger at historical injustice, the deep sense of having been gravely wounded. But again, the legitimacy of Professor Trask's personal feelings, as understandable as these feelings may be, does not bear directly on the question of how academicians ought to behave in their professional roles.

3. I am also ready to accept that there are ways in which nominally race-blind social institutions (like universities) can subtly disadvantage those with certain backgrounds. I agree that universities can do better in the task of uncovering and correcting what Professor Trask and others have called "institutional racism." Having done civil rights fieldwork in Mississippi in the 1960s, contending with the pervasive practices of racism there, I share what I take to be Professor Trask's concern to identify and overcome racism in all its manifestations. I would only want to add that racism is not only an offense when presented in its subtle institutional form. It is just as offensive and just as much a cause of concern when it is served up straight.

4. Finally, I accept that the First Amendment to the United States Constitution protects virtually all forms of expression, including racist speech, against legislative and judicial impediment. There are, to be sure, well-known exceptions like those for libel, slander, and yelling "Fire!" in a crowded theater. And lawmakers are permitted to "contour" legal rights to freedom of expression by, for example, requiring that permits be obtained prior to holding political demonstrations in the streets. As much as I personally despise Nazis, as offensive as I find their anti-Semitic message, I believe it would be wrong legally to enjoin them from marching

through Jewish communities. Accordingly I would argue that, regardless of how offensive the speech of a member of the university community, that conduct is and should continue to be protected by the First Amendment.

However else we may disagree, I expect that these are not the issues that separate Professor Trask and myself. If it came to it, I would hope that we would be on the same side of the barricades.

Where then do we differ? To understand this, we need to look at the concept of academic freedom. While the title of this panel is "The University and the Right of Academic Freedom," it is better, in my opinion, to understand academic freedom, not as a right, but as a privilege. In the present context, a privilege is a special liberty (one not extended to everyone) that is characteristically "carved" out of the rights of others. For example an ambulance driver, unlike the rest of us, has a privilege to activate a siren and flashing lights and to exceed the speed limit, obliging other motorists to pull over to the curb. The ambulance driver's privilege is at the expense of other drivers. This is the concept that should be applied to the notion of a "right" to academic freedom.

Roughly seventy years ago, the philosopher John Dewey was active in the struggle of the American Association of University Professors (the AAUP) to articulate, defend, and secure academic freedom as a central feature of academic life. The "privilege" of academic freedom is at the expense of the usual legal right of an employer to fire any employee for virtually any reason whatsoever or for no reason at all. The "firing at will" doctrine is the standard rule in American law. Though we may wish things were different, an employer generally has the legal right (in the absence of contractual agreements to the contrary) to fire an employee because she or he has made some statement to which the employer takes exception. Academic freedom is a secured special right against being fired merely because a university administrator has taken issue with what the professor has said.

Other employees have not fought for a right to freedom of expression in the workplace. Why are academicians so concerned about protecting this freedom? Why has the AAUP, since its earliest years, considered academic freedom to be absolutely essential in the university?

The answer requires us to understand what it means to be a scholar. In my opinion, the most persuasive reason for respecting academic freedom is that it is consummately improper for a university administration to hire a capable scholar to pursue

responsible judgment in some academic arena and then to specify, in advance, what conclusions that scholar may and may not come to. If you are going to have "scholarship" (as opposed to dogmatic indoctrination), you have to allow scholars to pursue the arguments wherever they lead, even if they lead to unpopular opinions running counter to received doctrine.

A university administration can properly fire a faculty member for dereliction of duty (not showing up in class, for example), for incompetence, or for being in clear violation of the ethical standards of the profession: what has been called "moral turpitude." But a university administration can not properly fire a professor for coming to and enunciating scholarly judgments that are somehow incorrect. A university is a context--a very precious context in my opinion--within which professors and students can pursue intellectual excellence, free from the usual fear that if you say something contrary to received dogma, the long arm of authority will reach out and strike you down. Academic freedom privileges professors by carving away the employer's right to fire, except for cause, strictly defined.

But privileges don't come free. Ambulance drivers are supposed to use their privileges only to perform certain correlative duties. If an ambulance driver activated his lights and siren and violated the speed limit, but only in order to get to a movie on time, we would all agree--wouldn't we?--that he had abused his privileges. We would all agree--wouldn't we?--that he should be "relieved of his responsibilities:" a telling phrase. Privilege is not license: reciprocal responsibilities come along with it. The ambulance driver only has the privileges he has because he has assumed those responsibilities. Likewise we academicians have the special privileges we have only because we have assumed special responsibilities.

The special freedom that scholars enjoy is a freedom to pursue intellectual excellence and academic responsibility. It is useful to understand the traditional scholarly disciplines--literature, science, art, philosophy, and so on--as sustained arguments, as debates, as traditions of mutual criticism. And as a consequence of what we in philosophy like to call this dialectical process, all of us are brought closer to an ideal of responsible judgment, perhaps to truth. In an environment like this, students and faculty have to be judged on the basis of the quality of their work. The university is supposed to be a jealously guarded, ruthless, meritocracy. The standards of evaluation for inclusion within this community are the standards that

are appropriate to the intellectual activities that we undertake. Preserving and protecting the university as an environment within which ideas can be judged solely on their merits is a primary responsibility of professors and university administrators.

How then is the privilege of academic freedom to be contoured? How are we to understand and shape its outer limits? Let us look at a concrete case in order to grasp the distinction between proper and improper exercises of academic freedom.

Many scholars have been studying the differences between men and women. Let us suppose, initially, that a psychologist has collected data that appear to him to establish a finding that women are significantly less adept at mathematical computation than men. Set aside the question of whether his work is good or bad science. The point I want to make here is that the professor should not be subject to administrative discipline solely on the basis that he has argued for a conclusion that is damaging to the self-esteem of some, that is unpopular, that may be wrong.

A university is not supposed to function to protect politically correct ideologies. On the contrary, if academic life is about anything, it is about questioning. Assuming that the professor has not violated the standards of the discipline of psychology in the design and implementation of his investigation, his behavior should be completely protected. His public statements may be unpopular, damaging, and, in the end, demonstrably false. Nonetheless the behavior of the scholar is protected. This is an area where academic freedom does its most important work. This investigator is entitled to the protection it affords.

Going a step further, suppose our professor recommends that university mathematics programs exclude women and that women be systematically discouraged from entering related fields. While many of us, including myself, would object to this policy recommendation, I would argue that academic freedom protects such a professor against administrative sanction solely for recommending changes of policy, no matter how foolish those changes are.

Finally, let us suppose that the psychologist, teaching a course that is heavily mathematical, turns to a female student on the first day of class and says "Dumb bitch, get out of my class." Academic freedom does not protect the professor in this case. This is clearly where we draw the line. But why here?

A professor has an obligation to hold open the context of inquiry to all members of the university community, to everybody there in accordance with the meritocratic principles that should

govern academic life. By insultingly attacking the dignity of another member of the community, the professor's statement contributes to making the university setting inhospitable to certain individuals in it, apart from considerations of individual merit.

Consider, for a moment, a Chicago judge who, in an off-duty speech to the Illinois chapter of the Ku Klux Klan, denounces blacks as racially inferior, demands that the Emancipation Proclamation be repealed, and that all "niggers" be sent back to Africa. While I would defend the constitutional right of a judge to make that speech, I take it that all of us would agree that this person should not be on the bench, at least in Chicago. The judicial office requires, not merely impartiality, but, as important, the appearance of impartiality. The judge's comments display a glaring disregard for these responsibilities and would be ample grounds for removal.

Like judges, professors and university administrators have duties of impartiality: responsibilities to carry on evaluation for membership in the community, not on the basis of race, sex, nationality, or religion, not on the basis of genealogy, but, rather, on the basis of individual merit. To the extent that academicians express hostility toward members of the university community because of their race, sex, and so on, these individuals call into question their suitability for the role of professor.

The same AAUP that has mightily defended academic freedom over the years, has also recognized the contours that apply properly to that privilege. In the AAUP "Statement on Professional Ethics," recently adopted by the University of Hawaii at Manoa Senate, we find the following language:

> Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as guides and counselors. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They protect their academic freedom.

At the University of Hawaii, the administration has recently adopted standards concerning sexual harassment. But the harassment that this new policy condemns is not wrong because the administration has prohibited it. Rather, the administration has prohibited it, in my opinion, because it is wrong. And harassment and the expression of disrespect for members of the community because of their race, gender, nationality, genealogy, and so on, doesn't require that the victim be a woman of color. Professors can treat others with

culpable disrespect whether those others are men or women, Caucasians or Japanese. The issue here does not concern the Hawaiian language. We are concerned with a wide array of terms that stand, with "haole," as contemporary expressions of contempt: "bitch," "nigger," "kotonk," "gaijin," "schwarze," and so on. It is hard to accept that administrators or professors could use such a vocabulary and not seriously call into question their suitability for their position. It is reasonable to believe that, when administrators and professors publicly and contemptuously use these terms, they betray their professional responsibility to "demonstrate their respect for students as individuals."

I do not believe that I have spoken the final word on these matters. It is plain that this university has much serious soul-searching to do before we can arrive at a defensible consensus. But the twin goals of understanding our collective mission as a university and delimiting our professional responsibilities within the university can only be reached by pressing on with the dialectical process, by working to discover the kernels of truth in what each of us says, and by treating each other with civil respect. Failing to do this, we forfeit our claim to be a university community and, indeed, we compromise our capacity to be any kind of community at all.

The Politics of Academic Freedom as the Politics of White Racism

HAUNANI-KAY TRASK

ALOHA KĀKOU. Aloha mai. I am Haunani-Kay Trask, descendant of the *Pi'ilani* line of Māui through my mother, and of the *Kahakumakali'ua* line of Kaua'i through my father. I grew up on the Ko'olau side of O'ahu and reside now in He'eia, one of the ahupua'a surrounding Kāne'ohe Bay. My people have been in these islands since the time of Papa and Wākea.

Tonight, I am going to relate a story that begins with the genocide of a Native people and ends with an attempt to silence one of their survivors and fiercest defenders. It is a story of white cultural and economic imperialism in its broadest outlines and of white hegemony and white racism on this campus. Specifically, it is a story of the politics of academic freedom as the politics of white racism.

But first let me tell you how a white foreign world, that is, the world of the *haole,* came to occupy the world of the Native, that is, the world of Hawaiians.

In 1778, a white foreigner came to our land with a pestilential shipload of other white foreigners. They wanted women, water, food, and general recreation, for which they gave my people syphilis, gonorrhea, and tuberculosis, along with ideas of predatory christianity, capitalism, and individualism. Forty-two years later, in 1820, a different class of aggressive *haole,* animated by hatred of all things dark and sexual, brought measles, chicken pox, and a virulent determination to replace the Hawaiian world with the *haole* world. Called missionaries, these white Americans were bent on conversion of my people and dispossession of our lands and waters. By this time 75 percent of my people--three-quarters of a million Hawaiians--had died from the coming of the *haole*. Conveniently

for the missionaries, the Hawaiian universe had collapsed under the impact of mass death. The fertile field of conversion was littered with the remnants of a holocaust, a holocaust created by white foreigners and celebrated by their later counterparts as the will of a christian god.

By the 1880s, most of our lands were owned by these same white American foreigners, who had convinced our chiefs that private property would give our people everlasting physical life. In 1893, when Hawaiians were but 5 percent of what they had been at contact, and when most of our arable lands were in the hands of foreigners, American marines invaded and occupied our country, overthrew and imprisoned our chiefly leaders, and established an all-*haole* puppet government. In 1898, Hawai'i was forcibly annexed to the United States against the wishes of the Native people. By 1900, all Hawaiian language schools were closed, political and economic life were dictated by the *haole*, and American institutions overtook the last vestiges of Hawaiian culture.

From this point forward into the twentieth century, Hawaiians have become increasingly like other Native peoples conquered and subordinated in their own homeland. We suffer a declining population, continued land dispossession, and ongoing destruction of our cultural ways. American militarism during World Wars I and II and the Vietnam War swallowed up more lands, while a steady outmigration of Hawaiians guarantees our minority status. As a nation and a people, Hawaiians are no longer self-determining.

For us, American colonialism has been a violent process: the violence of mass death, the violence of American missionizing, the violence of cultural destruction, and the violence of the American military. Once the United States annexed my homeland, a new kind of violence took root: the violence of educational colonialism, where foreign *haole* values replace Native Hawaiian values; where schools, like the University of Hawai'i, ridicule Hawaiian culture and praise American culture; and where white men assume the mantle of authority, deciding what is taught, who can teach, and even what can be said, written, and published.

In colony Hawai'i the University of Hawai'i stands atop the educational pyramid of the state. Like the military, the university is a guardian of white cultural dominance. The standard American university curriculum, bureaucratic structure, and white male faculty characterize the institution. People of color comprise over 70 percent of the student body, while the faculty is over 70 percent *haole*. For Hawaiians the situation is even worse: 13 tenured

Hawaiian faculty compare with nearly 660 white faculty. This situation constitutes institutional racism, the institutional dominance of white people over people of color.

Enter into this white male university a white male student named Joey Carter, lately come from the American South, where whites are not only dominant but where white supremacist organizations are on the rise. Complaining in a public letter to the student newspaper, *Ka Leo,* Carter mistakenly says that words like "*haole*-dominated" society and "puppet-*haole* governments" are racist, that "*haole*" is like the word "nigger," that white repression, persecution, and domination of non-whites is "supposed" (as opposed to actual), that he was chased and beaten by locals because of his skin and eye color, and finally ending his complaint by asserting that people are individuals (as opposed to members of historical groups) who can "classify" themselves as they like.

Clearly Mr. Carter was feeling uncomfortable in Hawai'i, where white people do not have the usual majority status or the unquestioned ability to categorize others as they do on the American continent.

Quickly following this letter came dozens of replies in *Ka Leo,* including one by myself, in which Carter was instructed about his place, history, and role in Hawai'i. Educating Carter about the history of white Americans, I explained that "*haole*" is in fact one of the few surviving Hawaiian language descriptions in common use in Hawai'i. I went on to say that Carter's appeal to "individual" exemption from the power and privilege of white hegemony is itself a typical American ploy to avoid responsibility for an ugly and vicious history that visited genocide on American Indians, slavery on Africans, peonage on Asians, and dispossession of both lands and self-government on Native Hawaiians. I informed Carter that he is a direct beneficiary, as are all white people, of racism, of a system of power in which one racially identified group dominates and exploits another racially identified group for the benefit of the exploiting group. In the United States people of color do *not* have the power to practice racism against white people. The same is true in Hawai'i, particularly in regard to Native Hawaiians who, contrary to Carter's beliefs, are not free to classify themselves, but are legally classified under American law by blood quantum. Hawaiians of 50 percent blood quantum are Native, those with less blood quantum are *not* Native.

Finally, I argued that the hatred and fear people of color have of white people is born of experience, the experience of white

violence. Therefore, it is for self-protection and in self-defense that people of color feel hostility toward the *haole*. This hostility, I went on, is not "*haole*-bashing" but a smart political sense of survival. There is no reason why people who have suffered genocide and land dispossession and who continue to be dominated by white people should like or trust them. It is our prerogative as the Native people of Hawai'i to decide whether, if at all, we should extend our trust and friendship to any *haole*. I closed my statement by suggesting that if Carter did not like Hawai'i, our language, or our ways of doing things, he could leave, since Hawaiians would certainly benefit from one less *haole* in our homeland.

My article was published on September 19, 1990. Five days later, on September 24, Larry Laudan, chair of the philosophy department and himself a recently arrived *haole* in Hawai'i, wrote a letter to the university vice-president for academic affairs, Paul Yuen, demanding my public reprimand for voicing such views and arguing that I was an administrator and therefore a spokesperson for the university. His request was followed by a philosophy department resolution, called a "Statement on Racism in Academe," alleging that my public reply to Carter was "racist," condoned "violence against a member of the University community solely because of his social identity and opinions," and consequently betrayed a "most basic professional responsibility," which they defined as a "special duty to protect and sustain the fragile atmosphere within which ideas can be assessed on their merits." Specifically the philosophy department alleged that my invitation to Carter to leave Hawai'i was similar to a white professor declaring black students unwelcome and proposing that they return to Africa. This resolution was sent by Laudan to Yuen on October 15, 1990, requesting that I be removed from my position [as director of the Center for Hawaiian Studies], which they alleged was a position of administrative authority.

This resolution was distributed widely to the press by Laudan and others, and was answered by University President Albert J. Simone on November 2, 1990. Simone assured his good friend "Larry" that "administrators may not speak for the University of Hawai'i without appropriate consultation with senior officers of the University." The President ended his letter by saying that his administration does not condone creating an "unfriendly, intimidating, and non-supportive environment for faculty and students."

On November 3, 1990, the faculty union of the University of Hawai'i reaffirmed academic freedom at the university "for the expression of all points of view regarding the racial issues recently raised on the Mānoa campus," and endorsing fair and open debate about race, colonialism, and any other related issues in Hawai'i. The union went on to reaffirm the position that chairs and directors are *not* administrators but faculty included in the collective bargaining unit, and as such are free to speak their minds without fear of sanction by the university administration.

On November 8, 1990, President Simone announced his intention to conduct an investigation into my statements, thus violating all semblance of confidentiality, something he prizes for white men. Simone told the *Honolulu Advertiser* by phone from Japan that he believed I was an administrator and that administrators must accept "the principle that some things are better off not said publicly." I think it's clear that Simone had made up his mind by this point: my public statements were *not* protected by academic freedom or free speech.

While Simone conducted his investigation, the faculty senate began their own, triggered by the same philosophy department resolution. For the first time in its history the senate, another white male bastion, decided to investigate a fellow faculty member for written public statements. Without precedent and procedures the senate moved ahead on the basis of the philosophy department resolution alone. Thus, by the middle of November a witch-hunt had begun in earnest, and the white male boy's club was hysterical with venom. Indeed, white men led the charge, with people like Gary Fuller of the geography department comparing me to Hitler and Saddam Hussein, and Dick Miller of the William S. Richardson School of Law telling the faculty senate that my thinking was similar to that which led to the rise of Nazi Germany and resulted in the internment of Japanese-Americans. Ken Kipnis, of the philosophy department, meanwhile, told one of my faculty supporters that the Hawaiian Movement was like the Ku Klux Klan, and that I would have to decide whether I wanted to be a professor or a member of the Movement. Charges of impending violence against white people surfaced everywhere, with the most virulent being made by Larry Laudan himself, proclaiming that I was giving "hunting licenses" to my students and other Hawaiians to beat up *haole*. This is the same Larry Laudan who told KHON news that my "brand of radicalism"

did not belong in a university, while attacking a rally in my defense as a form of "terrorism" on campus.

Despite numerous calls on my part and that of my supporters for Laudan and others who disagreed with me to come forward and debate the issues, I was charged and condemned in the media and in the faculty senate as a racist. The phenomenon known as McCarthyism--where individuals are accused, falsely, and never given an opportunity to confront or disprove their accusers--began to characterize the campus atmosphere. Hate calls and mail began to surface in the Hawaiian Studies office, *Ka Leo* ran a poll asking if students thought I was a racist, and stickers began to appear on campus, attacking me personally and raising the specter of white supremacist groups. Meanwhile the faculty senate proceeded, as did Al Simone, both determined to condemn me without once speaking with me. Indeed, most of my accusers had never read or thought seriously about my statement. They were content to read the philosophy department summary or the ellipses in the Honolulu dailies. The implication seemed to be that white men don't lie, so why read what the Native said, just trust the interpretation of her statements by knowledgeable white men.

And of course this is where the problem began. The philosophy department, like Joey Carter, is ignorant of scholarly and novelistic studies and portrayals of racism. Thinking that racism is a matter of color and not of history and power, the philosophy department intentionally misread my statements, which Larry Laudan then viciously recast, saying I was justifying violence against Carter. However, I never justified violence against Carter, only our rights as Native and oppressed people to feel hostility toward haoles. Just as Palestinians are justified in their hostility toward Israelis, just as Jews are justified in their hostility toward Germans, just as the Northern Irish are justified in their hostility toward the British, just as all exploited peoples are justified in feeling hostile and resentful toward those who exploit them, so we Hawaiians are justified in such feelings toward the *haole*. This is the legacy of racism, of colonialism.

I explained the long history of white violence against people of color precisely to educate Joey Carter about his place and history. For it is white people and *not* people of color who have a history of violence against others. In Hawai'i, it is the *haole* who stole our land, took our government, destroyed our nationhood, and suppressed our culture. It is white people who created laws to divide Hawaiians by blood quantum; it is white people who created

institutions foreign to our ways of life; and it is white people who brought capitalism to Hawai'i. In other words, it is white people who, for their own benefit, have exploited and oppressed Hawaiians. Carter, like most white people, did not know or want to learn any of this. But if I did not argue for violence against the *haole,* then why did the philosophy department and their vicious chairman say that I did?

The answer I believe lies in the fears and resentments of the *haole* themselves. Here in Hawai'i *haole* have grown accustomed to the myth of racial harmony created and reinforced by politicians and the tourist industry. *Haole* live in predominantly white or Asian neighborhoods, and if they know anything at all about Hawaiians, it is that we have a funny unpronounceable language, we appear on television as activists or other lawbreakers trying to stop development, and we have a deep wound, called the overthrow, when the all-white American government took our sovereignty. Yes, *haole* in Hawai'i are nervous because they know wrongs were committed in their names and for their benefit.

So when an uppity Native woman educates one of their own about his white history and his obligations to Natives, their fears and angers spill over into crazy accusations that, if examined, reflect back on their own sick history of violence. As Frantz Fanon has taught us, dark skin and dark people are the classic bogeyman of the *haole*. White people know that all over the world people of color have been brutally and unjustly treated by white imperialism. White people know how violent they have been to each other and to us and they know our grievances are real; and thus they imagine how much more violent we would be to them, with our *real* history of violations. This is why every demand for respect and recognition of dignity on our part is read as a sign of "violence." This is why white people so fear black people in the United States, despite the fact that it is white people who have a history of violence against black people and not the other way around. White violence, then, has a long and sick history--in the world, in the Americas, in the Pacific, and right here in Hawai'i. And this continues to be denied. The denial is evident in the philosophy department resolution.

For white male power and white racism are alive and well on this campus. Where else but in a colony would a Native woman be investigated by *three* committees for exercising her right as a Native and a citizen to publicly criticize a white man? Where else but in a colony would white administrators babble about "responsible" speech? Do they mean the "responsible" speech of Larry Laudan

defending certain forms of sexual harassment in a student publication called *Voices*? Or the "responsible" speech of Ian Reid, another white man, arguing the mental inferiority of women in the same student magazine? Or the "responsible" speech of Dick Miller accusing me of creating an atmosphere similar to the one that led to Nazi Germany and the internment of the Japanese? Or the "responsible" speech of Ken Kipnis comparing the Hawaiian Movement to the KKK when our Movement has never been violent? Is this speech "responsible" because it was spoken by white men in support of continued white male power?

Indeed, in the long history of Hawai'i, it is white people who have killed Hawaiians, beat Filipinos and Japanese on the plantations, and lynched and shot workers and denied them decent wages. It is white people who wanted statehood and who continue to deny us sovereignty. It is white people who continue to live on stolen Hawaiian land and thereby benefit from our dispossession.

Thus, "responsible" speech, as it is defined by white men, creates the parameters of academic freedom. White men can say all manner of dangerous, violent, and false things--absolute lies, in fact, like the lies of Miller, Kipnis, Laudan, and the rest--and their speech is acceptable. But when an articulate Native woman speaks the truth about the *haole*, she must be reprimanded, removed, and shut up. No academic freedom for her, nor free speech either, because--by definition--dissenting speech, speech that criticizes and opposes the prevailing system of colonial domination, cannot be "responsible."

Why? Because such speech is dangerous. It is the voice of political analysis and of a critical, alternative intellectual tradition. In my specific case what I wrote in my newspaper article was the truth, the unalloyed, ugly truth about *haole* power in the United States and in Hawai'i. This truth has anchored a great tradition of resistance created by Black and American Indian and Palestinian and Asian and Pacific Island peoples. Further, this tradition is unknown and untaught by most *haole* in this university, which means by nearly 80 percent of the faculty. Native people *do* have a claim to feel hostility toward their oppressors and Hawaiians *would* benefit from one less *haole* in Hawai'i; in fact, we would benefit from thousands less, beginning with the American military. Indeed, Native people all over the world would benefit if their colonizers went home.

So we come to the last McCarthy-like accusation by the philosophy department: I am guilty of racial harassment because my public statements created a "climate of intimidation" for Joey Carter.

First, let us be clear about what Joey Carter did. He wrote a public statement in a public forum, stating a position for which he alone is responsible. Part of that responsibility is that he must answer for his argument and for the reactions it provokes, both favorable and unfavorable, just as I am responsible for my public statements. But when Carter received unfavorable responses, from myself and others, he chose to blame his personal misfortunes on me and then to run away from the controversy. This in itself is irresponsible. In other words, Carter wanted to dish out nasty remarks but he did not want to be responsible for them.

Let us pursue the question of a "climate" of racial intimidation. How did I intimidate Carter when I have never to this day met, seen, or spoken with him? Indeed, to my knowledge, I have never even been near him. Am I, then, one of those primitive Natives with all sorts of "black magic" at my disposal, who can conjure up a climate, say rain or snow or in this case racial intimidation, at the scribble of my pen? Apparently I am, or so think Larry Laudan, Ken Kipnis, Dick Miller, and a host of other white men.

Tom Gething, university dean of students, investigated Joey Carter's allegations against me. This is a direct quote from Dean Gething's findings:

> "I have found no evidence that Dr. Trask, who has never met or spoken with Mr. Carter, discriminated against him in regard to his race or color. . . . I have found considerable evidence that a hostile environment in regard to race or color exists at the University of Hawaii-Manoa. This condition existed prior to Mr. Carter's column and Dr. Trask's response. It is clear, moreover, that the existence of this hostile environment was brought to the attention of the community and was highlighted by the two columns and the ensuing events. . . . However, I have been unable to determine a cause-and-effect relationship between either Mr. Carter or Dr. Trask and the existence of this condition."

Dean Gething says nothing about the historical antecedents of this "hostile" environment. I suggest that they are to be found, for anyone interested in searching them out, in the colonization of Hawai'i.

A hostile climate *does* exist at the University of Hawai'i, and the best evidence of it lies strewn all over the campus in hate flyers

calling for the dismemberment of an Asian woman who is an antiwar protester, describing a Black student from Nigeria who had the courage to support me as a "nigger" and a "dumb black boy," and calling me a "dominating lesbian sex offender."

But these are only flyers, you say. Well then, let's turn to white men in their classes, like Mark Merlin of the Department of General Science, who my students have complained about to the administration because he teaches that the royal insignia of our *ali'i,* called *lei palaoa,* are made out of female pubic hair. Or let's take Gary Fuller, who compared me to Hitler and whom my students also complained about because he says the Hawaiian language is dead and not worth learning. Or a number of political science and history professors who say that Hawaiians practiced infanticide when no credible evidence exists that we did. Or all the snide, off-the-cuff remarks that tell Hawaiian students their culture is primitive, undeveloped, or inauthentic. Does this create a hostile racial environment? Is this a form of racial intimidation? Or is this just history--white colonial history--that no one, not the philosophy department, not the administration, and certainly not the white press, is about to protest or investigate or condemn?

Yes, there certainly is a hostile environment on this campus, an environment that is similar to colonial environments in occupied countries all over the world, an environment that is Native-hating, that keeps power in the hands of the colonizers, and that attacks any dissenting voice, any political alternative. Intimidation on this campus is enforced by white racist ideology that praises and reproduces white racist culture and ensures the dominance of white faculty, white administrators, and white curriculum. This situation constitutes "intimidation" and worse.

This situation constitutes racism--the racism of white men with access to power, of Larry Laudan and the philosophy department, of certain members of the faculty senate, and of President Al Simone and his administration; the racism of members of one racially identified group--the *haole*--who oppress and subordinate another racially identified group--Hawaiians and other people of color--for the benefit of the exploiting group.

For who benefits if Hawaiians are degraded, if they are kept to a small population on campus, if one of their number is publicly investigated and removed? Who benefits?--white power benefits and white men benefit. Hawaiians, of course, lose. They lose a voice, they lose a fighter, they lose a place where defiance is taught

and encouraged. And all of us lose the richness of critical ideas, cultures, and people.

Academic freedom then--the freedom to learn, to teach, to argue, and above all, to dissent--is determined by white men. If they don't like what you say, they will try to shut you up by punitive actions and public vilification.

Let me just end by way of an update. All three investigations triggered by my column have been concluded in my favor--they have all concluded that nothing I did was worthy of reprimand or removal. But the message of all this investigating is simply this: if, in a public forum, faculty members of color exercise the right to argue a position that is contrary to, and critical of, white ideology, they will be investigated. Moves by white faculty or white students against people of color will be protected, however. The fact that President Al Simone has said to the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* that flyers calling for the physical dismemberment of an Asian woman who is an antiwar protester is the same as my supporters holding a rally and my program publishing a newsletter reveals that the President has lost all sense of proportion. In particular, the Nazi-like quality of the flyer against Mari Matsuoka, calling for her "sterilization" and the "fumigation" of this "vermin" from the campus is shocking. The combination of superpatriotic militaristic ideology in the flyer with this call for physical harm against Mari is a clear sign of the vicious intent of these racists. How President Simone can compare this to public statements in support of my position, although dissenting from his own, is remarkable. It seems that the President cannot distinguish between signed public disagreement that is in opposition to white ideology and anonymous death threats. Even the police consider such threats to be criminal and a violation of state law. But we have a President who thinks such behavior is only "deplorable" and not criminal, and who thinks that dissent equals physical harm.

To me, this state of affairs proves what I have been saying, as a Hawaiian and an intellectual, all along. White men protect white men, this university protects white hegemony. If any of you had doubts about this, the latest response from President Simone equating public dissent with death threats proves my point. I am certain the President would not think the same about death threats to white men.

Please, think about the comparisons I have drawn. When dark people are treated with less dignity than white people, that is, when Hawaiians and Asians and other people of color suffer racism,

and when threats against their safety are considered unimportant, indeed, frivolous, we are living in dangerous times.

Discursive Politics

KATHY E. FERGUSON

I WOULD like to step back from the accusations and counteraccusations that have occupied our campus in recent weeks, and look briefly at the political presuppositions and implications carried by the various languages that have been employed. I am not primarily interested in either attacking or defending the major antagonists or their positions, although I think my relation to them will become clear. But I am concerned with examining the major discourses, or ways of talking, that have been put into circulation through the recent controversies on race and colonialism on campus. Discourse analysis can be helpful here by showing that different languages are not simply different vehicles for saying the "same" thing; rather, different linguistic practices give some speakers and some utterances legitimacy, while undermining others or hiding them from view. I want to look at how events get talked about, and how the kind of talking that gets done shapes the conclusions that can be drawn.

I see three major discursive regimes operating:

1. the discourse of academic freedom,
2. the discourse of racial harassment and intimidation, and
3. the discourse of anticolonialism.

1. Academic Freedom

The discourse of academic freedom guarantees the freedom to speak and write freely without fear of administrative or governmental control. It is the academic offshoot of the first amendment, guaranteeing freedom of speech and expression. The University of Hawai'i definition, as established in our faculty contract, is a fairly restrictive one; it accords faculty members academic freedom to teach, research, and publish in their areas of expertise. Even by this relatively narrow definition of academic freedom, Haunani-Kay Trask's statements in her now immortalized *Ka Leo* article are clearly covered--it would be hard to dispute her

claim to expertise in Hawaiian studies and even more difficult to deny her legitimate access to a public forum such as a student newspaper. My point here is not simply that the discourse of academic freedom covers this incident, which I think it clearly does; rather, my point is to investigate that discourse and see what possibilities are opened up or closed off by its practices.

The discourse of academic freedom is primarily a procedural one. It is quite abstract and ahistorical--it does not distinguish between persons or groups in terms of the positions they occupy or the histories that put them there. In that sense it is the loyal grandchild of the liberal tradition that spawned it. I have always thought of academic freedom and freedom of expression as quite mainstream and establishment in their political status. After all, what could be more all-American than the first amendment to the constitution. "Rights talk," as the discourse of rights is often called, seemed rather innocuous. Ken Kipnis's comments on academic freedom reminded me of why I felt this way: he has defined academic freedom as "a limitation on a normal right that employers have to fire employees." This view takes the power of owners and managers for granted and then asks when it might be qualified, rather than asking who ought to control the workplace and toward what ends. It is not clear to me why it is less important for, say, a bus driver to be able to speak his or her mind than it is for a professor to do so; but it is clear that the discourse of academic freedom will never raise that question.

A recent poll of University of Hawai'i students, one often duplicated on the mainland, suggests that a large number of students are both unfamiliar with and suspicious of the first amendment, so I guess I should not take it for granted. More to the point, our current controversies suggest that this face of the Western liberal heritage has some potentially radical implications: it can make a space available for other kinds of talk than "rights talk," talk that questions the established powers and problematizes the taken-for-granted circumstances of our lives. Anticolonial discourse raises these kinds of questions and provokes these problematizing moves, and academic freedom is the necessary guarantor that such political discourses can be articulated.

2. Racial Harassment

The discourse of racial harassment names Haunani-Kay Trask's article as contributing to a "climate of intimidation" (from "A Statement on Racism in Academe" unanimously adopted by the

philosophy faculty, *Ka Leo,* October 26, 1990), and as committing "verbal abuse" of a student (letter from Larry Laudan, chair of the philosophy department, to the *Honolulu Advertiser,* November 10, 1990). This discourse contrasts the solemnities of "academic study and research" with the dangers of an "atmosphere of intimidation" and "inflammatory statements" (article by Laudan, "UH faculty owes students civility"). Another element of this discourse involves calls for "professionalism." Calls for "professional responsibility" take for granted the power relations in the university and call for them to be properly managed. The relation of professors to students are seen as parallel to those between physicians and patients, or between therapists and clients, or even parents and children. The possibility of a different, more egalitarian or contestable set of relations is rendered unspoken and unspeakable.

This discourse has some elements in common with the discourse of academic freedom. It too is abstract and ahistorical, rejecting all angry or critical talk about racial identities with little attention to the situations or the histories of different groups. Thus, members of the philosophy department can equate a Hawaiian woman's suggestion that a *haole* return to the mainland with a mainland white person suggesting that a black person return to Africa. "Racism" in this discourse refers to any negative statement about color, thus making it impossible to consider how people of different colors are positioned in their times and places.

The discourse of racial harassment and intimidation is the offspring of one element of the discourse of sexual harassment, that which deals with "an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment" (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Sexual Harassment Policy and Complaint Procedure, September 1983). This presents a dilemma to feminists, including myself, who want to pursue sexual harassment charges against some faculty while dismissing racial harassment charges against others. One way out of this dilemma is to find the sexual harassment language blameless and charge the philosophy department and others with wrongfully appropriating it for an illegitimate use with regard to race. But this is just too easy, and it sidesteps an important political question. When a position that one affirms comes to bear an uncomfortable resemblance to a position that one opposes, then it is time to reexamine those positions and the relation they maintain to one another.

The sexual harassment language, or at least some elements of it, are based upon what Nietzsche would have called a "slave

morality:" it creates a discursive universe in which there are only two possible subject positions, that of "us" and "them." Since "they" are bad, oppressive, and powerful, and we are not like them, then "we" must be good, innocent, and powerless. Any inconvenient abridgements of these categories--such as the times when some of "them" get hurt and some of "us" wield power--are reabsorbed into the discourse without challenging the fixity of its categories. This discourse has brought into circulation a set of categories in which students are by definition victims and faculty are by definition aggressors. It is quite predictable that the philosophy department and others would slide Haunani-Kay Trask into the second slot and Joey Carter into the first; the way has been paved. Further, this way of talking creates a discursive space in which some kinds of speech come to be called "harassing," "intimidating," and "silencing." Finally, it demands the creation of the bureaucratic and linguistic practices in which administrators are charged with coming to the rescue of victims, speaking for victims, and thereby enshrining them in their victim status.

I believe that this element of the sexual harassment discourse (please note that I am not talking about *all* elements of this discourse; I am explicitly not talking about unwelcome sexual advances, sex-related rewards and punishments, and so forth) has very predictably created the opportunity for the racial harassment discourse to be born. Rather than seeing charges of racial harassment and intimidation as the illegitimate appropriation of an otherwise unproblematic language, I think we should reexamine this element of the sexual harassment discourse itself. I think that it primarily benefits administrators, not women or students, by turning gender relations into a management problem rather than a political issue. In a discursive space where charges of harassment and intimidation are hurled vigorously back and forth, and administrators are petitioned to discipline the alleged offenders, something very important becomes impossible to say: it becomes impossible to *oppose* someone, to *disagree*, to dispute their position with arguments, examples, or sentiments. Arguments and accusations with which one disagrees should be met by opposing arguments and accusations, not by claims to have been "silenced." I recognize that in this messy and often acrimonious process of public debate, one might feel intimidated and offended; my point is that the best response is to marshall the personal and collective resources that enable further debate, not to ask the authorities to discipline those

whose speech has given offense and thus to bring political talk to an end.

3. Anticolonialism

The third discourse audible in the current discussions is that of anticolonialism. This is the most explicitly political of the three discourses. It has something in common with the discourse of racial harassment, in that it too names a moral universe in which a virtuous "us" confronts an oppressive "them." But unlike the first two discursive regimes, this one is obviously historical and concrete--it names the actors and events that overthrew the government of Hawai'i, decimated its population, assaulted its culture, and then disguised the conquest in a disingenuous language of development, mutual benefit, and ethnic harmony. At her best, Haunani-Kay Trask's contribution has been to articulate this discourse and put it vigorously into circulation.

The contributions of this discursive practice are immense. It wrests the discursive domain away from the offices of administrators and rule-makers and back into a domain of public speech, where political arguments can be articulated and debated. It becomes possible to say, not that my opponent should be disciplined by the authorities, but that my opponent is *wrong*, and here's why. This kind of discourse should not be expected to be always pleasant, well mannered, or comfortable to hear; it *can* be expected to be public, to educate, and to be available for debate. I think that the discourse of academic freedom is the indispensable base for the articulation of political discourses such as those of anticolonialism and feminism, and that political discourses can provide needed strategies for reviving the public life of the university rather than strangling it in the name of protection.

The Responsibilities of the Academic

PETER MANICAS

WORLD WAR II provoked Dwight MacDonald to speak of the responsibility of the intellectual. Responding to the US war in Vietnam, Noam Chomsky pursued this idea. In my title I have replaced "intellectual" with "academic," not because there are no intellectuals in the academy--I hope that there are--but because we are, in any case, academics. That is, as Professor Kipnis rightly observed, we are paid employees of an institution whose primary responsibility is to our students. Teaching is what, presumably, we are paid to do. The 'presumably' is also important: very many of us do very little teaching and all of us who are promoted and tenured--tenure, of course, was designed to protect academic freedom--are *not* promoted or tenured *because* we are good teachers or because we spend our time with students. We are promoted and tenured because we publish--mostly inconsequential papers and books read by very few people.

This is a commonplace. I cannot in what follows pursue this problem, even if it bears vitally on my line of thought. I mention it to begin with because it raises three questions. First, given that we are paid to teach, what does this presuppose and what does it exclude? Second, might it be that the university is structured so that it inhibits the very ideals it explicitly seeks to promote? Might it be, for example, that we are just plain hypocritical in saying that we expect academics to be good teachers? Perhaps all we really want is that faculty not cause trouble, that they devote themselves to producing harmless homiletics on arcane topics, and that in class they ensure that students are "comfortable." Third, does the fact that we are employees, as Professor Kipnis says, make academic freedom a "privilege?" And if so, is it the case that those who hire

us may legitimately put constraints on what we say and *how* we say what we say?

What, then, are the responsibilities of academics? It was Thomas Jefferson's view that academics should provide independent criticism of those forces of church and state which "fear every change, as endangering the comforts they now hold," to "unmask their usurpation, and monopolies of honors, wealth, and power" (quoted by Roszak, p. 5). As seems clear, he did not think that this responsibility was inconsistent with our primary responsibility to students.

Jefferson's view was prominent in the founding statement of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), offered on the eve of the US entry into the "war to make the world safe for democracy."

> The responsibility of the university teacher is primarily to the public itself. . . . One of the university's most characteristic functions in a democratic society is to help make public opinion more self-critical and more circumspect (quoted by Roszak, p. 30).

It was, of course, just at this time that the American university came to exist in what is its now familiar form. And it was just at this time that Veblen saw that, constituted as it was, the university could not do what Jefferson and the AAUP said it should be doing. The title of his book suggests why not. In full it is: *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Businessmen*. Veblen saw that the success of academics would depend upon their abilities to please their employers, who in turn had to please those who funded them. He saw that this would lead them to forbear from any "colour of iconoclasm," and, instead, to offer "complaisant interpretations and apologies" (p. 187). Veblen was, of course, *non grata*, a troublemaker.

There have been others. While the opening shots of World War II were being fired in Spain, Robert Lynd made another effort. His *Knowledge for What?* warned that the academic community had divided itself into "scholars" and "technicians." The scholars had made their work "remote from and even disregarding immediate relevancies." The technician accepted such a narrow definition of the problem that he could only put himself in the service of narrow interests--interests which, of course, very much tended to be pecuniary (p. 1).

In the midst of the Cold War, C. Wright Mills reasserted the Jeffersonian challenge. As professors, Mills wrote, academics address students, but "on occasion," academics address publics of larger scale. In this role they ought to have two goals: by showing how personal troubles and concerns are not independent of social issues and problems, the academic helps the individual to become "self-educating," and as regards society, the aim ought to be "to build and to cultivate self-cultivating publics" (p. 206).

The ideal and the problems remain, noticed recently even by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the President of Harvard University. Rushworth Kidder pondered:

> Somehow [for me, at least, it is clear enough both how and why!] we have constructed a society in which the connections are missing between the best minds and its worst problems. And we haven't merely tolerated that gap. We've actually fostered it by carefully isolating most academic research and the messy realities of the world--a point argued in fine detail in *Universities and the Future of America* by Harvard University's President Derek Bok (Vol. 38, January 30, 1991, p. B1-2).

But it was, perhaps, Chomsky, in the essay mentioned earlier, who put our responsibility most directly: it is the responsibility of the academic to try to tell the truth and to expose lies.

What is presupposed by this? And what does it exclude? J. S. Mill got it right: it is a condition of our responsibility to try to tell the truth that there be freedom of opinion. To suppress an opinion is to presume that you have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. But no one is *ever* in a position to know this. Hence, it is *never* right to suppress opinion. Mill, of course, acknowledged that people could have no right to shout fire in a crowded theater, nor to stand in front of the corn dealer's home and call for violence against him. Nor, we should add, does the utterance "Get out of this class," angrily shouted by a teacher to a student in the class, count as an expression of opinion. It is a category mistake, and a potentially pernicious one at that, to suppose that these are expressions of opinion. To be sure, there will be times when drawing the required distinction will be contestable, as for example, KKK signs and speeches in Skokie, Illinois. But we can and must distinguish between the expression of opinion, written or oral, and acts that are harmful in exactly Mill's sense that they cause

"perceptible harm to identifiable individuals" (*On Liberty*, p. 329). One might, of course, justify censorship of troop movements on exactly these grounds.

Now, remarkably, everyone believes in "free speech" and the present instance, presumably, is not a free-speech issue. As the philosophy department said: "We strongly support [Professor Trask's] right to express views, however controversial. But this must be done in a manner compatible with the academic freedom of others and the responsibilities that accompany professional and administrative positions" (*Ka Leo*, October 31, 1991, p. 5). Professor Farr of the philosophy department noted subsequently: "The question . . . is not whether Professor Trask has a right to express [her views on race] but whether by the manner in which she did so, she violated a student's rights" (*Ka Leo*, December 10, 1990). Three observations seem pertinent.

First, I was more than stunned to discover that there was *any* sentiment on the campus in favor of the view that because Professor Trask was an "administrator," she therefore was deprived of rights that a "faculty member" would presumably have. Indeed, I was more than depressed to discover that colleagues seriously supposed that by virtue of being members of the faculty, people lack First Amendment privileges that all other citizens have. We may be employees of the university, but we remain, I hope, citizens. Indeed, the idea that as faculty we abrogate such rights is manifestly incompatible with our responsibility to try to tell the truth.

Second, it is by now a *liberal* commonplace that the right to free speech admits of all sorts of qualifications. The prominent Harvard philosopher John Rawls has asserted that "Liberty of Conscience is limited, everyone agrees, by the common interest in public order and security" (p. 212). But what does this mean concretely? Are we to assume that officialdom, either the officers of the state or of the university, is competent to decide what counts as "the common interest in public order and security?" If Rawls has the yelling of "fire" in mind here, then he makes the category mistake just alluded to. Perhaps he would include analyses of war, or racism on campus, utterances which might subvert official policy or the "monopoly of honor, wealth, and power." And if so, what of Jefferson's challenge?

More recently, a new argument has emerged. It is one that is directly pertinent to the present case. It has been offered by feminists and those who aim to eliminate prejudice on campuses (including the "grand prejudice" that the curriculum should

"privilege" the work of dead, white males). According to this argument, the right to free speech must be subordinated to the guarantee of equal protection under the law. Thus, since it constitutes a "hostile environment" for women, pornography is itself a violation of the civil rights of women. The argument is not, as I understand it, that pornography *causes* people to harm women. Rather, pornography is itself harmful to them. Similarly, utterances which create a "hostile environment" for minorities violate their rights to an equal education. It is not, let us be clear, racist *practices* that are here the concern, for example, discriminatory admission or hiring practices. Rather, the thesis concerns racist utterances. Accordingly, "hate speech" is now outlawed on some 130 campuses (and strikingly, if the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* is correct, the inspiration for many of these campuses came from an article by Mari Matsuda, on leave from the University of Hawai'i's Richardson School of Law). The Stanford Code (which she helped to draft) bans "discriminatory harassment," harassment aimed at a disadvantaged minority. This includes "intimidation by threats of violence and personal vilification of students on the basis of their sex, race, color, handicap, religion, sexual orientation, or national or ethnic origin" and (remarkably), any "message of racial inferiority . . . directed against a historically oppressed group" which is "persecutorial, hateful and degrading" (*Honolulu Star-Bulletin* November 26, 1990, "'Hate' word wars ignite campuses"). Again, the argument is not restricted to threats but is extended to include racist theories and utterances. As Professor Ferguson rightly observes, the "discourse" on "sexual harassment" on this campus has been appropriated in the present case. But as seems clear enough, the operative principle is the idea that *any* act *or* utterance which creates a "hostile environment" for "oppressed" persons is "harassment" and is thus potentially coercible.

My third observation, then, is this: As best as I can understand the argument of the philosophy department, they would seem to be taking a position similar to the one just sketched: speech can be repressed for "politically correct" reasons! There is one difference, of course: this is Hawai'i, not Madison, Wisconsin, or Storrs, Connecticut. The philosophy department, of course, insists that "racial harassment and the victimization of students are unacceptable regardless of their source and regardless of their target." That is, one can be a member of what is admittedly an *oppressed minority* and still be guilty of "harassment." Accordingly they argue that a white male is being harassed by a Hawaiian female.

I am by now myself stunned to discover the proper context for this issue. Put simply, did Professor Trask's remarks in *Ka Leo* constitute a violation of the civil rights of Joey Carter or, worse, of all the *haoles* on campus? Did these remarks create "a hostile environment" in which these rights were violated? Were Professor Trask's remarks in *Ka Leo* appropriately "racist?" Did she overstep the boundaries of a "proper" exercise of her freedom of opinion?

I am tempted to answer these questions--all in the negative--but would prefer to insist that we reject the assumptions that generate the questions. Once we accept the principle that a person's rights are being violated when others use speech that *they* deem to be "racist" (or "sexually abusive"), we have accepted a principle that allows unprincipled repression. Once we allow that regardless of the conditions in which utterances occur, speech itself constitutes "harassment," we have started down a slippery slope which has no bottom. Beauty may well be in the eyes of the beholder; if "harassment," similarly, is constituted by any utterance which a person finds "offensive" or which makes people "uncomfortable" or which, in their view, creates a "hostile environment," then we had best cease to teach.

Of course, faculty are obliged to forbear from harassing students, but surely any reasonably clear, adequate, and enforceable criterion (as Professor Laudan argued in responding to *Voices!*) would require that the faculty be in a position to harm, coerce, or otherwise manipulate a student. (There is indeed such a thing as psychological harm, but psychological harm is not equivalent to what a person finds offensive or hostile.) There are both sexual and racial harassers on this campus. Indeed, there are *terrorists* on this campus--and we need to respond to this. We have not done so. As Professor Trask notes, it is shameful that the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa administration refuses to condemn manifest terrorism while, at the same time, it expresses concern over a *Ka Leo* essay. There is tragically a symmetry here. If those who are most vocally concerned with "harassment" adopt criteria which, if enforceable, are totalitarian, then we have given officialdom all the argument it needs to repress what it chooses to repress and, at the same time, to do *nothing* about genuine harassment.

I conclude where I started: It is the first obligation of the academic to seek and tell the truth. The university is structured to discourage this and we shall not change this overnight. But this much is clear enough. When, in 1859, Mill wrote *On Liberty* he

could appeal to an already grim record of repression in the name of truth. Surely, our century has endlessly reconfirmed this, and surely, once we play fast and loose with freedom of opinion, we have given authorities, in the university and the state, just the weapons they might well like.

There are those who will disagree with Professor Trask's political goals (though they first ought to understand them!). Others will take exception to her political strategy, and perhaps, as well, to her style. But that there should be any question that she should have been reprimanded, or still worse, relieved of her administrative duties or fired, is a worrisome burden for all of us. Indeed, with this horrible war in the Gulf, we need to reaffirm loudly Jefferson's challenge.

REFERENCES CITED

Chomsky, Noam. 1968. "The Responsibility of Intellectuals." In *The Dissenting Academy*. Ed. Theodore Roszak. New York: Vintage.

Lynd, Robert S. 1964. *Knowledge for What?* New York: Grove.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Roszak, Theodore. 1968. "On Academic Delinquency." In *The Dissenting Academy*.

FORUM 2

The University's Responsibility Toward Students

February 14, 1991

MODERATOR

Mary Tiles

PANELISTS

Josh Cooper

Kishore Dash

Kaleimomi'olani Decker

Susan Hippensteele

Robert Wisotzky

Introduction

MARY TILES

THIS SESSION differed from others in the series in that the panelists were all students and neither the announced topic nor the discussion of it was focussed on the issue of ethnic peace. There is here a wider issue--the university's responsibility to *all* students. Realization of these responsibilities is an essential precondition of ethnic peace on campus. Failures lead to alienation and disaffection in the student body as a whole, or within specific subgroups. With the exception of Kaleimomi'olani Decker, the panelists represent constituencies whose boundaries are not ethnically demarcated. Since this forum was held, more than one person has commented that it was the first occasion they could remember on which such a cross section of the student population had been heard and heard to have expressed their deep alienation from the university as an institution. The experiences giving rise to this attitude varied with the situations of the speakers--Hawaiian, international, female, male, graduate, undergraduate. But the message was clear--on many fronts this university is failing its students and failing them in ways which are particularly serious for an educational institution officially espousing liberal democratic educational ideals. This was exemplified in the frequently inconsiderate and discriminatory treatment of international students catalogued by Kishore Dash. For too many of our students, particularly at the undergraduate level, education, far from being a process of empowerment, is perpetuating a sense of dependency, intellectual inferiority, and resentment.

At this point I can hear some of my colleagues replying, "Students everywhere always complain. There is nothing unusual in this and so nothing to be concerned about." It is true that a certain level of discontent with the status quo is normal and is even a healthy sign in a student body. It is indeed something necessary to the health of a university as a whole.

However, as Robert Wisotzky pointed out, this is a positive factor only when it is allowed to play the role of a vitalizing force, prompting and providing significant input to a process of continuing critical review of all aspects of the functioning of the university (which is not the same as acceding to every demand). This would suggest that if the forum's public discussion of grievances was a rare occurrence, if the attitudes expressed took people by surprise, then student discontent is not currently being heard or being allowed to play this crucial positive role. The very fact that this forum series was structured so as to preclude student-faculty or student-administration dialogue is indicative of the problem.

Native Hawaiian Students and the Role of the University

KALEIMOMI'OLANI DECKER

ALOHA KĀKOU. I'd like to speak to you in Hawaiian, but I know that some of you don't understand me, because a lot of Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians don't understand our language, since it has been suppressed in our own homeland.

Before I start my speech I'd like to give you a little hint on why I'm here. I was not invited to this forum until early this week, and I confirmed it this evening. It was told to me that this panel was going to go on without a native Hawaiian, and that there will be other panels without native Hawaiians on them. I think it's a travesty for this university to have panels discussing racism and the responsibility of the university without any Hawaiians present on the panel.

I am a council member of Make'e Pono Lāhui Hawai'i, which is a Hawaiian student union recently created to bring about the complete liberation of all Hawaiian people, by educating Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians about the oppressive nature which Hawaiians face from the state of Hawai'i and America. Make'e Pono Lāhui Hawai'i proclaim ourselves as sovereign Hawaiians, responsible for the protection, promotion, and perpetuation of our inherent rights.

Tonight I am here to address the native Hawaiian's rights to education and the university's role in it. The responsibility of the university is to eradicate racism toward Hawaiians. This racism is not new. It did not start when Professor Haunani Trask addressed Joey Carter in *Ka Leo,* as Larry Laudan and Simone claimed. Prior to this controversy Hawaiians have and still face racism in the classroom.

I would like to ask Larry Laudan if he would write a letter to Simone, to the *Star Bulletin*, the *Advertiser*, and our ever famous *Ka Leo,* pointing out racist attacks against Hawaiians in the classroom. These racist attacks are various. They range from white male professors claiming that hula was originated by Hawaiians

working in the *lo'i,* where *kalo,* taro, was growing; or professors who claim the sacred Hawaiian symbol, the *lei niho palaoa,* was woven from female pubic hair. For Hawaiians this is not only logistically incorrect, but it is culturally offensive.

Hawaiians sitting in classrooms made up of three hundred students, mostly non-Hawaiians, see this as a direct attack on themselves and their culture.

I don't see Larry Laudan fighting for these Hawaiians. Neither do I see him fighting for a new Hawaiian studies building. Isn't it strange how departments that assist Hawaiians at this university are shuffled off into small offices at the edge of this campus, while the Travel Industry Management school receives a luxury complex full of comfortable lounges and large offices. To me this is a blatant display of racism. TIM, the mechanism that continues to rape my culture, is comfortably seated on stolen Hawaiian lands.

Why, as this university sits on Hawaiian ceded lands, must Hawaiians pay tuition? Non-Hawaiians benefit from the use of our lands. We don't need to pay tuition. We should be coming to this school tuition free, with housing for all Hawaiians, and parking right by the classes; everybody else can stand behind us.

Another responsibility of the university is to ensure a safe environment for academic debate. Not only has Professor Trask received harassment from racists, other than Larry Laudan and Simone, but Hawaiian students have received threatening phone calls and letters. We are forced to walk around this campus carefully watching people's glances and watching them as we talk and converse.

The university listens to our ideas and labels us "baby Haunanis," as if we don't have minds of our own, as if Hawaiians are unable to form their own ideas and think critically.

Hawaiians must speak out and express our ideas without being disqualified by non-Hawaiians. Yet what forums allow Hawaiians to express their ideas? The 'Ka Leo o Hawai'i' does not adequately represent students, especially Hawaiian students. It took Hawaiians several meetings with the editor, K. Mark Takai, and his staff to make him and his staff aware of the racist handling of the Joey Carter incident. After these meetings, *Ka Leo* continued to attack Hawaiians by biased surveys and racist cartoons. And it was only two weeks ago they decided to put the *'okina* in Hawai'i. But they won't continue to put the correct marks on other Hawaiian words that they use in their texts. That is racist also. I am sure that

K. Mark Takai would not like it if I started to spell his name incorrectly, like K-Mart Takai.

I do not support the *Ka Leo* as a voice of the students. It appears to me to be a voice of the administration. I would like my money, that gets taken out of my student fees, to be put into a special fund for a Hawaiian newspaper written by Hawaiians, for Hawaiians.

The time is past when Hawaiians will ask for their proper position on this campus. At this time right now we demand it.

Sexual Harassment and the University's Responsibility

SUSAN HIPPENSTEELE

MY FANTASY was to be able to address the topic of "The University's Responsibility to Students," in a "larger picture"--to use sexual harassment merely as an example which illuminates a set of problems which are intimately woven together. I keep having these feelings of deja vu--that I have said it all before too many times. So I wrote a talk about the larger picture, a talk that was very angry. So angry, in fact, that I had to step back to figure out why. Eventually I realized that the anger came through because I was still talking about sexual harassment, only using different words. I realized that anger does not work--it seems out of place--when we speak in generalities. So rather than try to ignore my anger and frustration, I am going to talk about sexual harassment (I suppose that is why I was asked to speak anyway).

In order to understand what has occurred in response to sexual harassment here at the University of Hawai'i, we need to acknowledge the fundamental problem which affects each of the issues we will be speaking about today: that is, the difference in opinion over the goal and vision of this university. It is here that our analysis must begin, because the perspective we take on this basic issue affects our desire and ability to address each of these problems, individually and collectively.

It is quite clear that our administration, while paying lip service to the needs and rights of students, in fact views education as a secondary objective of this taxpayer supported institution. With money goes credibility. Our administrators pay enormous salaries to famous researchers who can't teach, and deny tenure to wonderful teachers with less impressive vitae. Many of the research facilities here are incomparably well endowed, while students are unable to work in them because they must earn a living wage outside

the university. While the legislature debates the number of seats for a new stadium, international, exchange, and local students have no housing. I could go on and on, but I'm sure you get the point. The priorities set for this institution simply do not reflect the educational needs and desires of the students.

When we first began talking about sexual harassment here a few years ago, nobody listened. A few students and faculty made some noise and the response was basically that sexual harassment was a nonissue. Then *VOICES* interviewed a student who had been sexually harassed, and the entire situation changed. Everyone was outraged--at *VOICES*. The administration tried to censor the magazine, demanding that it not be released. It was released anyway and faculty came forward claiming that they were being libeled. In fact, several faculty made this claim, although the story was only about one student and one faculty member. Others wrote to say that we students had to begin to act like adults--to take responsibility for our own actions. Still others were angered that the student's identity had been kept anonymous (although the faculty member's name and department had not been published either). Eventually the furor over this particular case died down, but the problem of sexual harassment did not.

This event set the stage for the next one. When the Breaking the Silence Coalition plastered the names of four sexual harassers on posters on campus, the campus was ready. Hysteria ensued. There was outrage that such charges were being made anonymously. Faculty, male and female, tripped all over themselves to be the first to lend their support to these four libeled men. Never mind the fact that each and every conversation held the footnote, "these guys are all notorious sexual harassers," the cry was for procedural justice--substantive justice be damned.

A year or so earlier, when the administration called for a task force to address the problem of sexual harassment and included students in the group, we students who had been fighting this issue were overjoyed. Finally, here was our chance to make a change. We spent days, nights, weekends, researching, talking, writing, doing more research, and revising a policy which would address the real experience of sexual harassment. *God, we were naive*. When it became clear that we had, in fact, been merely token members of the committee, and that our ideas were not only dismissed but were delegitimized, we realized that the only possible gain to be made was to expose the hypocrisy of the process--which we are still doing.

Underlying this entire problem of sexual harassment is the fact that we are individually and organizationally unwilling to acknowledge the power differential within this community. I think academics in general suffer from this deception, but here at the University of Hawai'i we see how this denial, combined with abuse of power which is all but openly condoned, creates a situation in which students are not only disenfranchised, we are overwhelmed by the injustices we bear. When we take our experiences public they are personalized and trivialized. The President of this university told a woman who asked him about my case that it was just a "paternal kiss which was misunderstood;" that I "blew the whole thing out of proportion." His response to me when I asked him why he did not answer any of my letters was that his "staff keep him in the dark about things like sexual harassment because they know he will fight this problem and never give up," and he has "lots of more important things to do"--and people wonder why I am angry.

Cloaking the power differential releases faculty and administrators collectively from ethical responsibility and moral obligations to students, and perpetuates individual dramas which cross the boundaries between professional and private lives. The problem for students has been that we have been unable to find a language with which to communicate the difficulty of working within a system we are also trying to resist--trying to define and defend in the same breath.

During the civil rights movement of the 60s and 70s, the legal process itself was revolutionized by smart lawyers who saw great potential for expansion of definitions of discrimination within liberal legal philosophy and practice. However, this expansion has not occurred. Instead, reductionist legal language has been used to maintain the status quo, and we hear claims of reverse discrimination and reverse sexism. The law defines discrimination as "not showing favoritism"--"not showing favoritism" of course manifests itself in continued oppression of women and minority groups. So subjective experience is subordinate to legal doctrine, and we continue to mask oppression with arguments of equality, neutrality, and freedom under the law. Within this law people of color can be racist, women can be sexist, and those of us who label our experiences ones of oppression are hysterical and paranoid.

Here at the University of Hawai'i all arguments regarding sexual harassment have been reduced in this manner. We are collectively unwilling to acknowledge that individual perception

defines sexual harassment. We focus instead on the intent of the harasser, the age of the victim, and other irrelevancies. Victims are asked to produce witnesses and learn very quickly that there is a hierarchy of harassment. If we were stroked, fondled, or kissed, we might have a case (as long as we have witnesses). If we are ogled, leered at, or threatened, we are told about the "gray areas" of sexual harassment and that it is "his word against ours."

We as a community reproduce legal arguments and defenses which elevate academics above the hoi-polloi--our grievances are met with the self-righteous indignation of those eloquent men who harass us. Our arguments are twisted and thrown back at us as accusations.

Because we are in the impossible situation of having to define our experiences in legally defendable terms, we strengthen the positions of those already in power. We worked to develop a policy which was quickly used against one of our own. We distance ourselves from highly personal issues to strengthen our credibility and are then accused of not having suffered from our experience.

I am told again and again by people who are trying to be helpful to emphasize the obvious and avoid that which is more difficult to understand. I know that should I follow this advice *my* way would be easier--the criticism I receive would be less sharp, but the experiences of hundreds, even thousands, of students will continue to be hidden. On "Dialogue" last week I gave two examples of sexual harassment involving the so-called gray areas of sexual harassment. Monday morning I was swamped by women thanking me for telling it like it is--women who wanted to share the number of times they had been offended by just the type of behavior I described.

We must begin to address this and other problems here at UH in new and creative ways. Mentoring relationships, for example, need to be reexamined. Relationships between students and faculty have always been fraught with tension, but with the entrance of women and minorities into universities and colleges, the potential for abuse of these relationships grew exponentially. Because mentoring is both vital to the academic process and loosely defined, mentoring relationships are negotiated individually and are largely controlled by the more powerful member of the mentoring dyad. When the academic power differential is compounded by gender and racial hierarchies, the potential risks for the student begin to outweigh the potential advantages of the mentoring relationship.

Acknowledging the power differential between students and faculty, women and men, people of color and whites, does not demean students, women, or people of color, and calling all people equal under the law does not give us all equal access to resources. We must subvert efforts to undermine with legal rhetoric arguments about issues such as sexual harassment and other forms of oppression. A new level of analysis is required--analysis which reflects the reality of academic life. Those with institutional power must acknowledge the effects of their power on those with less, and students should not have to be the ones to point out that faculty and administrators are individually and collectively responsible for our academic well-being. The time has come to place the onus of responsibility for this analysis where it belongs. This university cannot continue to expect those of us who suffer sexual harassment or any other form of systemic oppression to shoulder responsibility for their own victimization.

The University's Attitude Toward Students

ROBERT WISOTZKEY

LAST WEEK a member of the audience, an admitted professor, approached the mike and related how he had received an anonymous note from a student. He confided that he knew that the note was from a graduate student because the grammar was correct. How rude! And shame on the members of the audience who laughed as he categorically insulted the students of this university. Displayed in these acts is a contempt for the abilities of students, a sense of superiority, power, that somehow makes it alright to ridicule an individual. Remember that by saying that the grammar was correct, he means that the argument was presented in a thought process that he could recognize. To his credit, he took the time to consider the argument.

The administration is trying to keep students off the Board of Regents using arguments that imply that students are not sophisticated, committed, or knowledgeable enough to make decisions about their own future. Regents, says University of Hawai'i President Albert Simone, "are not people who have a lot to learn." Other arguments state that students cannot separate themselves from their everyday lives when they are forming an opinion. By extension, administrators and regents claim this ability, though in fact, these people were supposedly chosen because their experiences and expertise are applicable to running a university. They are asked to use their experience, but would accuse students of being shallow if they do the same.

Kathy Ferguson last week alluded to the view held by some that the faculty-student relationship is similar to that of physician-patient or parent-child. This implies that faculty have a special knowledge that students do not possess. Is such a special knowledge of the same order of the physician sending a sample down to the lab and parents knowing how to copulate?

Are students really naive, bumbling idiots who must be tended, watched? Must they be led to knowledge? Constantly told what is best for them? Told what is the proper way to think about things? Are the faculty and administration really in possession of that much more experience and knowledge that it gives them license to assume these responsibilities for everybody? This appears to be one of the major views expressed on campus, particularly by those who have assumed those responsibilities. Can this view be justified, considering the state of affairs of this university? I would answer no.

I cannot offer new insights nor can I express the views better than they have already been expressed. Nor do I have any knowledge of education theory. The governor has cut the funds that would have provided me with that training. I like to consider myself an evolutionary geneticist. I study the biological basis of behavioral changes and try to relate and extrapolate it to evolutionary change. So this evening I will give you a lecture on evolution, I will try to draw a parallel between evolutionary thought and the situation of the university.

Before I start, I want to stress that I am using the analogy of evolutionary biology to try and draw insight into the dynamics of the university. I am not saying that because this is the way I see it in nature, so it must be. I am not a Social Darwinist. That philosophy is an outgrowth of Western thought that was used to justify subjugating the peoples of the world. I am making this connection because my interpretation of nature is the result of my thought process. And as a product of human thought, it may have a relevance to human interactions.

Darwin's theory of natural selection has two distinct components. The first is random variation. The second is the environment, which acts as a selective agent on the variation. In other words, out of diversity can emerge a variety that has the qualities that it needs to survive. The same argument can be applied to the university. We have the system we do because it was the one that best suited the environment at the time. The system we have is a living fossil of when the university was run by white males for white males, and the forces outside the university were also white males. The social positions of the individuals in the university were equal--it was that of privilege. This university, though still run by privileged white males, was run to educate the "inferior" masses. The university community can no longer be considered a homogeneous population of inferior people. The same rules can no

longer be applied, though the administration does try. In nature, the inability to adapt to an environmental change leads to extinction. Similarly, sticking to the same concepts and methods because that is what worked in the past will lead to the death of creative thought.

Population genetics also shows us that it is the groups that are on the outside or the fringe, not the ones in the center, that are best able to change. It is these groups that have been existing under extreme and adverse conditions, adapting to conditions that are not optimal for their growth. This description fits like a glove the women and people of color on this campus.

A similar argument could be made for the student body as a whole. There are over 25,000 students on this campus, 2,300 faculty, and 97 administrators. There is a steady selection for individuals who can survive in the academic environment. Those that have survived are not necessarily the ones that will be able to initiate change. For them, the system worked. When the environment changes, the diversity to respond to this change will be found in the least selected group, the students.

My analogy breaks down because we are not dealing with a genetic system, we are dealing with a human mind. We can and should expect those individuals who have survived the system to be able to change with it. Though it is certainly possible, it would be a mistake to expect the change from within. It is a supreme act of arrogance for the administration to assume that that is where the best ideas for change will be. It was an arrogance that was displayed when a committee was formed out of the university community to deal with affirmative action, only to have that committee replaced by a blue-ribbon committee appointed by President Simone.

As a student I have voluntarily placed myself in the power of the faculty in order to expand my knowledge. It is the abuse of this power that is the root of the problem. Students do not exist to support the egos of the faculty, and if a faculty member is threatened by the ideas and knowledge of a new mind, they should leave academe. As a white male it is easy for me to tolerate or ignore abuses of power by faculty. I know that I will someday be able to place myself away from it while staying in the system (unless I choose to participate myself). Tradition and the system guarantee it. Women and people of color have no such guarantees. So we must work to change the system so that the abuses stop, so that the guarantees are available to everybody.

I opened with the story of the professor who would have been surprised to have an undergraduate student express herself or

himself in proper English. I defined the proper use of language as representing a similar, or at least recognizable, thought process. The students are here to learn a thought process that will enable them to survive in society. This is the selective process I referred to earlier. This thought process, the development of intellect, the development of self-worth, is more important than any fact they will learn in these hallowed halls. As the students learn this process, they struggle to reconcile its idiosyncrasies. It is this struggle that is most important, because both the student and teacher can learn from it. It is this struggle that shows us how the system can be changed for the better. When all parties realize this, then there is a potential for growth. Since the students have placed themselves in the faculty's power in order to learn, it is the faculty's responsibility to recognize when the students' struggles will lead to a failure to achieve their goals and to help the students to refocus their efforts. In this way, faculty can insure the preservation of self-esteem. Just as being a physician is more than reading lab reports, and parenting is more than procreating, teaching is more than just disseminating facts. The most important thing education gives us is a sense of self-worth, a broad sense of knowledge, and the ability to express it.

FORUM 3

UH Policy and Procedure: Affirmative Action and Grievances

February 21, 1991

MODERATOR

Barbara Siegel

PANELISTS

Doris Ching

LaRene Despain

Nancy Lewis

Anita Liu

Mimi Sharma

Mie Watanabe

Panel Report

Introduction

Barbara Siegel

THE OTHER DAY I was party to a discussion that dealt with implementing affirmative action, nondiscrimination, and equal opportunity policies. The participants were largely important and successful Caucasian middle-aged males. It was fully recognized that it was "good to have minorities and women on the employment rosters," although personally many did not understand why; one of the answers implied it was necessary so that the boxes could be properly filled out on required forms. Statements were made by a number of them to the effect that they were willing to overpay women and minorities for proper and socially acceptable representation in their units--not because these underrepresented groups necessarily deserved equal or extra pay, but rather because they (women and minorities) were a rare commodity and, therefore, should be collected--a little like modern art, which may have significant social, aesthetic, and financial value, but nevertheless cannot be taken too seriously. As I was leaving a non-Caucasian male said to me, "They don't understand, do they. We just want to be equal."

Over the last twenty years or so, equal opportunities and affirmative action plans have had an impact and brought about change. Talented women no longer have to graduate as "Yale men" or be listed as an "American Man of Science." But in many ways the overt discrimination of yesteryear was visible and could be recognized, at least, if not corrected. Now the subtle hostility and differential treatment of women and minorities is covert. We often hear those in positions of power explain how they are "protecting," "defending," "guiding," and "doing the heavy or difficult work to save" those of "lesser" talents from the burdensome tasks of power brokering.

Much of the discussion in this series has dealt with the deep problems that resulted from the "caretaker mentality" that came with the missionaries to Hawai'i, and with it the extant international overtones of the recent Gulf war.

As the old joke goes, "I let my wife take care of the house, make the car payments, and raise the kids, while I, the man of house, make the big decisions, like how to create world peace." So I am going to take the good wifely role and deal with the issues at hand--the loss of self-esteem, the anger, frustration, and the implicit ethnic and gender discrimination which still occurs.

The panel that I chaired was composed entirely of women--which was in its way rather surprising and a little shocking. Though women make up over 50 percent of the population, you only have to turn on a TV set to see that panels who deal with substantive and important issues are generally all male, all white, and all upper middle class, except when the topic deals with ethnic or gender related themes, and then a mix of people is more apt to occur. We expect a token woman these days, but are still astounded to see all women, and women of color, too, in a predominantly male situation.

The all-woman panel I chaired was called a "dazzling" group, but later this statement was ameliorated--it was our ability to think logically, clearly, and come well prepared to address an audience that was the "dazzling" feature of our group. It was a well-meaning comment, but all of us on the stage smarted--we have worked very hard to achieve our positions and in the process have learned to bite our tongues; we are intelligent, well educated, sensitive, and aware of ourselves and others; and, yes, we also know how to dress for success.

DR. DORIS CHING, Vice President of Student Affairs, described the the new programs that have been established or expanded at UH-Mānoa over the past five years for the benefit of women and underrepresented ethnic minority students. These include the following.

The UH-Mānoa Children's Center, a child care program primarily for children of UH-Mānoa students, subsidized by the State of Hawai'i, was established in 1987 and accredited in 1989 by the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs.

The Office for Non-Traditional Students was established in 1989.

The UH-Mānoa Women's Center was recently established in March 1991.

"Creating Options for a Rape-Free Environment" (C.O.R.E.), an acquaintance/date rape education program initiated at UH-Mānoa in 1988 with excellent cooperation and leadership by the Sex Abuse Treatment Center of the Kapiolani Medical Center, is recognized nationally as a model program.

The University of Hawai'i Commission on the Status of Women was reestablished and reaffirmed in 1986.

Operation Kua'ana, a recruitment and retention support program for Native Hawaiian students, was established in 1988.

Operation Manong, a recruitment and retention support program for Filipino students, has been expanded.

The College Opportunities Program (COP) for disadvantaged students has also been expanded.

The Community College to UH-Mānoa Transfer Program was established specifically to assist underrepresented ethnic minority students in adjusting to the transition from the smaller community college campus to the complex and large campus of UH-Mānoa.

A new position of director of minority student affairs was developed and filled in 1990.

A state-funded $1 million per year Hawai'i Opportunity Program in Education (HOPE) endowment for scholarships was established in 1990, which will enable the state to provide scholarships beginning in the year 2001 for financially needy underrepresented ethnic minority students, similar to the "I Have a Dream Foundation Scholarship Program" founded in New York by Eugene Lang.

PreFreshman Engineering Program (PREP), is a cooperative program among the University of Hawai'i, the Hawai'i State Department of Education, and the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations to provide summer enrichment and followup of Native Hawaiian and Filipino seventh graders from disadvantaged areas who demonstrate strong abilities in mathematics and sciences.

Hawai'i Summer Academy for gifted and talented seventh graders of Native Hawaiian and Filipino backgrounds was established with external funding by the Jacob Javits Gifted and Talented Grants Program.

In addition to these programs, new categories of tuition waivers have been created to increase women and minority students' access to higher education. Tuition waivers are now provided by

Operation Kua'ana, Operation Manong, Minority Students, UH-Mānoa Children's Center, and the Office for Non-Traditional Students.

Despite these developments, which are indeed of importance to the campus, we have yet to adequately address other issues which are also serious and critical: violence and crime on campus, racism, sexism, and sexual harassment.

The Secretary General of the Pacific Science Congress, DR. NANCY LEWIS, Professor of Geography (and please note, that it is Secretary General and not general secretary--a sad mistake that is unfortunately made too often) presented demographic and historical data on the changing patterns of women, with special emphasis on the academic setting. Statistics for 1987-1989 from the National Education Association indicated that 35 percent of all Ph.D. degrees were granted to women. As one might expect, degrees granted in the "hard" sciences were dominated by men, but even in the humanities only slightly over half (55 percent) of the degrees were earned by women. While these statistics suggest that progress in recruiting women to higher levels of academic achievement is slow, the situation within the academy is even worse. If recruiting is dependent, in part, on appropriate role models, a dearth of tenured women faculty in many departments in universities may help to explain the above statistics.

In 1984 an article entitled "UH Women Organize to Fight Bias" appeared in the *Honolulu Star Bulletin*. A number of us on the panel were among those women and we are all disappointed in the progress that has taken place--or not taken place--since then. It is true that more women are being hired at the assistant professor rank at the University of Hawai'i, but will they gain tenure and become permanent faculty at UH?

In 1989 only 19 percent of the tenured faculty at UH were women and only 9 percent of the full professors were female, a total of fifty women. Furthermore, although the statistics are difficult to collect, women do not seem to be promoted at the same rate as men. Even more disturbing is the fact that women are overrepresented in nontenurable faculty positions at UH. Forty-three per cent of women, as compared to 19 percent of men, were in these insecure and often deadend positions in 1989. Is this progress? Perhaps if you are a hare.

We have an affirmative action plan at the University and it gains pages each year, but it is certainly not proactive, at least judged by its results. Departments are rated on affirmative action according to a complex, somewhat artificial national standard: U (underutilized), A (acceptable), or A- (marginally acceptable), based on the number of women in the national "hiring pool" in each discipline.

By way of example, for most of the ten years that Nancy Lewis has been on the faculty at the University of Hawai'i she has been the sole female faculty member in geography, yet during these years, the department usually received an "A" rating. In an environment where we are used to grades, one female on a faculty of 13.75 FTE (full time equivalents)--and one could easily speculate on which of the faculty was the 0.75--is hardly an "A." Twenty nine per cent of all the Ph.D.'s granted in geography at UH since 1971 have been granted to women, and this is very similar to the proportion granted at mainland universities. While the faculty composition is partly due to demographics and hiring patterns in the past, these facts do not explain the entire situation.

In all fairness, the geography department has tried to hire more women, at least in the last several years and the department was successful last year. Good, highly qualified women are in demand and the University of Hawai'i is in a particularly difficult position in this competitive market. The national statistics show that women Ph.D.'s, if they are in domestic relationships, are much more likely to have as partners other professionals than are men. Try to find two professional jobs, in or outside the University, in Hawai'i. With respect to academic jobs, the University could be much more creative in this arena and follow the lead of a number of mainland universities, which actively try to identify or create positions for both individuals. Women may be older, already have children, and the very real problems of education and housing loom large for both men and women, but perhaps larger for women.

Once women are hired and gain tenure, they often find themselves "stuck" at the lower professional and administrative ranks. All of the panel members know the demands of being a "precious jewel"--requests to serve because they need "women"--or "a woman with your skills." There are other more subtle demands, both personal and professional, that we face, particularly when we are the only woman in the Department--from isolation and lack of a support network (young girl's club) to being heavily sought after as a role model and mentor by women students. Much of our activity

along these lines can be very rewarding, at least at the personal level, but it can also sidetrack us and lead to slower progress in the areas where we are judged, research and publication.

For those that choose--or are chosen for--administration, there is definitely a "glass ceiling" in the academy as well as the marketplace. How many women deans (outside of those in predominantly female professional fields of nursing and social work) and women senior vice-presidents are there at UH?

At times we may be our own worst enemies, succumbing to what may be cumulatively untenable demands of both our colleagues and our students, convinced at least subconsciously that we are in fact "superwomen." As noted in the introduction, great confusion surrounds the question as to whether Nancy is the Secretary General or general secretary (and even the printer who produced the circulars reversed the order) of the Pacific Science Congress. It is the former, although rumor has it that she and the other women panel members all type, and on PCs, too.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LARENE DESPAIN spoke eloquently on the issues of student and faculty sexual harassment and the need for people to speak out and organize. Even though the "caretaker" mentality is a potential improvement over the overt hostility and brutality that existed, and still exists in some parts of the world, repeated studies indicate that one-fourth to one-third of students on most campuses, including the University of Hawai'i, have been sexually harassed. If one were to include, and it is now supported by legal precedence, the "hostile environment" and its impact on one's ability to work and learn, probably close to 90 percent of women and large numbers of minority people would say they have personally encountered this form of aggression. The graffiti, the threats, and the requests for formal censure are all indicators of this "hostile environment" right in our own backyard. Professor Despain is also cochair of the Faculty Women's Caucus and in this capacity she presented one grim example after another of the denial of equal opportunity that University of Hawai'i women have had to face.

Grievance and Affirmative Action: The Case of Maivan Lam

(The following piece is a shared venture. The introduction is by LaRene Despain and the analysis of the case is by Maivan Lam.)

Introduction

LaRene Despain

In a press conference held about a year ago, March 6, 1990, the University of Hawai'i Faculty Women's Caucus highlighted its call for an affirmative action plan at the university by presenting four cases of women who had been variously discriminated against. Using these cases as a justification, the Caucus called for three actions: the settling of the four cases, a restructuring of the EEO/AA office on campus, and the strengthening of affirmative action at UH.

One year later, not much has been accomplished. Only one of these cases, that of Professor Mimi Sharma, has been settled satisfactorily, through the intervention of the union. Maivan Lam's case concerning discriminatory hiring at the UH Law School will be tried in federal court in April. Susan Hippensteele still does not know the disposition of the case against the man who was found to have sexually harassed her. Barbara Allen has been denied tenure in a process which included input of a Dean who harassed her for four years. The EEO/AA office still does not, in the opinion of the Caucus, function as an independent protector of women's and minority's rights. The University still does not have an adequate affirmative action plan. Two recent reports, one by the WASC accrediting team and the other by the Legislative Auditor, both criticize the present AA system as inadequate. Joined by thirteen groups on Campus, including Ethnic Studies, Hawaiian Studies, Women's Studies, members of the ASUH, and the Commission on the Status of Women, the Caucus recently sent a letter to the Board of Regents asking them to support a movement toward a stronger affirmative action plan.

Within the last two years, the university lost one woman faculty member in speech and one in English, and this year we will lose women in ESL (2), psychology, architecture, and women's studies. All of these women have said explicitly that they are leaving because of a chilly climate for women or because of out and out harassment. Each of these women, I might point out, has gone to a

prestigious position at another university, where they find the climate to be quite different.

The four cases the caucus presented last year all help to show why we are losing these women. We talked to President Simone about these cases as part of our attempt to move him toward an affirmative action plan, because we feel strongly that justice is created case by case. An affirmative action plan that does not ensure justice for specific women and minorities is meaningless.

Maivan Lam, in speaking of the grievance procedures she went through in attempting to resolve her case against the law school makes one central point: Grievance procedures at UH are aimed more at damage control and public relations than they are at justice. Speaking out of her experience, both in trying to resolve harassment grievances and in seeking tenure, Barbara Allen agrees. Indeed, Allen's is a classic case of continual harassment, a fact conceded by and mentioned in the report of the very hearing officer who declined to overrule her denial of tenure. The office called the School of Architecture a "morass," commented that "the Dean established a pattern where massive energy was invested in contentious behavior," and added:

> There is no way of knowing whether, given a more benign and academically professional school administration, Ms. Allen could have eventually integrated her stimulating student-centered teaching style with a more organized instructional content and methodology.

The officer concludes that "no faculty member should have to function under the conditions Professor Allen faced." Indeed, Professor Allen did have to function for four years under conditions which can only be termed "harassment." The UH administration was fully aware of these conditions during most of this time, yet they never attempted to resolve the situation. Indeed, the administration insisted, at the time of tenure, that the Dean be allowed to have a part in the tenure proceedings of Professor Allen. They seemingly were never interested in improving the climate under which they forced this faculty member to work, but were concerned only with damage control.

Maivan Lam makes this same process--of trying to safeguard images while wholly disregarding justice--clear in the following account of her case, which combines general thoughts on affirmative action with specific reference to particular experiences.

Analysis of a Particular Case

Maivan Lam

Affirmative action, I would like to point out, historically stands as nothing less than the latest agonized attempt by the oppressed of this country to complete the eternally unfinished business of civil rights.

For those of us--minorities, women, and political dissidents--who have had to demand that Bachman Hall observe equal treatment and affirmative action in specific incidents in our lives, the struggle has been agonizing. In my own case, for example, if President Albert Simone had simply affixed a sign on the Law School door that said, "No Vietnamese woman with leftwing politics allowed," my life would have been simple, but his, you can well imagine, would have become quite complicated. Committees would be formed to talk about *him,* for exhibiting these signposting compulsions. As it is, Simone does run around handing out signs to deans and department chairs, but he escapes notice because the signs he hands out are smarter second-generation signs which say, "The best-qualified candidate only." Their advantage over the first generation of exclusionary signs is that they deflect the discussion away from the sign-maker to *me,* and persons like myself, and what might be wrong with *us* since we never seem to make it past the signs. Mind you, it is remarkable that we don't ever get past them, given how very porous they are in other respects. Quality control is certainly not what these signs are about; consider how many mediocre white males they have let in, to occupy the university's highest offices at that!

Affirmative action, as we know, consists of at least three interlinked parts: recruitment of women and minorities, support for their successful performance, and safeguards against their harassment and discrimination. I shall focus on one very important element of this last part: the handling of grievances. Clearly, failure here either frustrates, as in my case, or jettisons, as in the case of many women who have left this university, recruitment and retention. The jettisoning mechanism works as follows. A woman, or a person of color, is recruited to work or to study at this university. Sometime thereafter persons in their departments start to harass or discriminate against them. This alone can cause many to leave, drop out, go crazy, stop functioning, or in other words fulfill the expectation of failure, the "I told you she was not the best qualified candidate" set-up.

If in addition the grievance procedure itself also harasses and discriminates, as I'll show happened in my case, and apparently those of others I've talked to, the result is the disaster we have on our hands. In other words, the situation that now obtains is that not only are those charged with detecting harassment and discrimination at this university shying away from their responsibility and, indeed, unique opportunity to redress decades' worth of the exclusion, exploitation, and humiliation that have been visited upon women and minorities, they are in fact adding to the sorry record.

The specifics of my case will illustrate that the grievance process at UH is about critic-busting and "damage control," and not about truth or justice. As many of you know, I applied for the position of director of Pacific Asian Legal Studies (PALS) in the Richardson School of Law in the spring of 1988. During the course of my application, a senior male professor singled me out for discriminatory attention by making untrue and irrelevant comments about my scholarship and politics. An illegal candidate was introduced into the proceedings. Nevertheless, I was one of four final candidates selected from a pool of one hundred applicants. However, when the full faculty, which is predominantly white, received the recommendations, it did something highly unusual: it cancelled the search before even studying dossiers or interviewing candidates. I filed a grievance against the unwarranted cancellation, and now list some of what followed to illustrate why the grievance process at UH is a mockery, not just of the University's supposed commitment to affirmative action, but to ordinary principles of fairness as well.

Item 1. Simple requests to have a colleague of my choice accompany me to meetings with Vice President Anthony Marsella, had to be argued and fought over each and every time.

Item 2. A Marsella Commission charged with investigating my allegations of procedural violations questioned me for less than thirty minutes, more than ten of which probed not the substance of the violations, but how I had learned of them.

Item 3. Mie Watanabe, the university EEO/AA officer, who was investigating my charges of discrimination, never interviewed me at all after I filed formal charges. Her finding of no cause was based on testimony of Law School faculty that I never had a chance to rebut.

Item 4. Before I could appeal Marsella's ruling to President, Simone, as I was entitled to, the Law School, unknown to me, was told to start its new search, which had been put on hold pending

investigations. In other words, even as I, in blind good faith, pursued my appeal, which asked that the original search be *continued,* the exercise had been turned into a joke by Bachman Hall's telling the Law School to pursue the very activity that was in contention.

Item 5. Doris Ching, Vice President of Students Affairs, handled my appeal. She wrote, in her formal finding, that her review of prior investigations showed that the search had been marred by a breach of confidentiality *and* other irregularities. Bachman Hall has never revealed what these irregularities are, let alone offered restitution for the harm they caused. Neither have they made any effort to see that such irregularities would not occur again.

Item 6. On the contrary, Simone has caused me further professional injury by publicly declaring that the reason the Law School cancelled its search was because the finalists were unqualified. Interestingly, the Law School itself did not originally claim that any of the four finalists were unqualified. It initially said instead that it was not sure what was wanted in the program.

Item 7. Simone, who technically signs off on the grievance procedure, has insistently claimed that three separate and independent investigations exonerated the Law School of any wrongdoing. Asked at a deposition by my lawyer to name the three investigations, he faltered. The reason is simple enough: there never were three such investigations.

Item 8. The tone adopted through this period was one of "damage control" pure and simple--not justice, not concern for the fate of a minority woman candidate. If I had to be further injured in the cause of saving the image of the university, so be it. If I have one major regret in all that has happened in the last three years it is this: that I was not intelligent enough to refuse to participate in the grievance process in place at UH, that I did not demand an independent campus investigating mechanism from the start.

Item 9. Marsella promised me that the new search would be a "fishbowl" operation minutely supervised from Bachman Hall. No such supervision was ever provided. The result: discrimination and retaliation of the most blatant sort again assailed my candidacy in the second 1990 Pacific Asian Legal Studies search.

Item 10. The only mandate that Bachman Hall issued as a result of my grievance emphasized the need for, not fairness, certainly not affirmative action, but *secrecy* in university searches. The only lesson that Bachman Hall drew from the Law School affair is that Maivan C. Lam knew too much. In other words,

discrimination can remain the business of the departments and the schools--but by God coverup will become Bachman Hall's business.

Item 11. Lastly, lest you think that the PALS director's job is a normal faculty position where candidates stand an even chance of uniform scrutiny, let me note a recent *Honolulu Advertiser* interview with Simone in which the latter is asked whether he would give the former East-West Center President, Victor Li, a job. Simone's answer: "Victor has not asked. But . . . One logical place for him would be . . . Asian-Pacific legal studies." There is only one position in that program, and that is the position of director for which I applied. Once again, even though a lawsuit is pending, even though a court has ruled that enough evidence of a Title VII violation exists to warrant the serious business of a trial, the president of this university tosses the job in contention, for the asking, to an exemplar of that most recyclable of phenomena: the politically powerful male. My entire grievance effort, it is clear, has been a joke for Simone: It is the funny thing that happened on the way to affirmative action in the year 3,000.

Professor Derrick Bell, the eminent African-American professor of law at Harvard, recently submitted, not so tongue-in-cheek, a proposal for intelligently compromising with racism in America to a Madison conference on critical race theory. Rather than spend unending decades and centuries more in agonizing attempts at eradicating the ineradicable, he urged people of color to campaign for a National Racism Licensing Board, which will issue, for a hefty fee, tags that formally permit licensees to discriminate. Proceeds are turned over to people of color to do with as they please. Thus, *they* discriminate, *we* collect. Not being original, I say let's plagiarize Bell's idea for UH. Forget grievance procedures. Be proactive. Stop the free ride. Get paid!

DR. MIMI SHARMA, director of the South Asian Program and anthropologist, talked of her own personal experience in trying to have her position at the University regularized. She presented a set of accomplishments and responsibilities that the University has acknowledged as a significant contribution to the campus, yet when she requested to be considered for tenure, as any man would have done years earlier, a convoluted administrative maze suddenly was imposed, wherein the "rules" changed randomly and obstructively. Her case for tenure is still pending.

The University of Hawai'i's Equal Opportunity Officer, MIE WATANABE, described her role in the University's compliance with the letter of the law. She pointed out her dual role of advising those who may have legitimate concerns and complaints but, on the other hand, she must also protect the University's good name when a grievance is filed. Her role is advisory and although she can recommend to the President sanctions that might be placed against those found in violation, she has no direct authority to bring about change. Her main roles are education, advising prospective grievants and those grieved against, and maintaining records required by law.

The last woman to speak was PROFESSOR JUANITA LIU, the first woman to become a tenured full professor in the School of Business at the University of Hawai'i. The conflicts that women often encounter in both the academic and business community were analyzed and potential alternatives proposed. What does a woman, or a minority, or even a minority woman, have to do in order to attain appropriate career advancement and just rewards in a man's world--or does it have to be in a "man's world."

Part of what happened in the interaction of this group and the audience was a call for immediate action and a need to address the larger questions and bring down the barriers to full participation of all segments of the population in any and all societal decisions. We can no longer afford to make simple adjustments to accommodate women and minorities, especially in the academic setting. Universities have traditionally been the leaders in technical and theoretic studies, and have housed the errant scholars and sheltered the advanced thinkers. It is, therefore, very anomalous to find a reluctance to reshape the structures within academe that would not only allow, but also support ethnic and gender diversity.

Not only must inequities in hiring, promotion, tenure, and salary be corrected, but a supportive climate must exist for all students, faculty, and community. When flyers appear on campus, albeit transiently, that state "sterilize the bitch," referring to a female faculty member, the climate is not the balmy Hawai'i we tout.

Of all places, Hawai'i should celebrate its diversity, but the University of Hawai'i is not the pastoral and cloistered setting that its self-image projects. While we attempt to solve the world's problems we should also give a little more quality time to solving those at home.

FORUM 4

The Legacy of Racism and the Role of the University

February 28, 1991

MODERATOR

Franklin S. Odo

PANELISTS

Emanuel J. Drechsel

Manfred Henningsen

David E. Stannard

Kathryn Waddell Takara

Introduction

FRANKLIN S. ODO

THIS PANEL of distinguished faculty created an environment in which a series of highly charged issues was argued. Indeed, the presentations themselves were virtually lost in an extraordinary explosion of audience reaction, particularly on the part of Native Hawaiian students who interpreted certain key positions as assaults against their efforts to combat racism on the Mānoa campus. Perhaps foremost of these questions was the definition, nature, and function of the category of race itself and, most important, the appropriateness of using that concept in the war on racism.

It appears to me that one critical dynamic, unrecognized at the time, was the confrontation of two competing propositions. Two of the presenters, Kathryn Takara and David Stannard, represented the view that the concept of race needed to be turned in against itself and used to confront individuals, groups, and institutions before it could be expunged from the language or reality of the academy. Emanuel Drechsel and Manfred Henningsen, on the other hand, suggested that since the concept itself was false and corrupt that this "fantasy" construct be abandoned and that the notion that the major battle is against white racism be reexamined. They insisted that the very employment of the concept would not only impede the struggle against racism but might contribute to its strength.

Emanuel Drechsel provided a straightforward presentation which documented the "Invalidity of the Concept of Race," with an emphasis on the anthropological uses and abuses of the idea. Very little of this was subject to much debate, especially with an academic audience, but his remarks were interpreted to mean that any use of the term--including "racism" itself--was illegitimate. Thus, while Drechsel did not become the focus of the long and heated statements following the presentations, his remarks helped fuel the controversy that ensued.

Manfred Henningsen's direct challenge to the antiracist strategy and tactics employed by Native Hawaiians like Haunani-Kay Trask and Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa provoked angry discussion. Henningsen argued, essentially, that the quest for justice was being subverted by the mistaken proposition that, as Professor Trask had put it in her letter to Joey Carter in *Ka Leo* (September 19, 1990): "racism is a system of power in which one racially identified group dominates another racially identified group for the advantage of the dominating group." He went to some lengths to discuss the "two most murderous racist regimes in this century," namely Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan, which perpetrated the worst horrors on people of their own race. For Professor Henningsen, then, the problems of Native Hawaiians or other minority groups or peoples of color need to be resolved by looking to other constructs of power.

Kathryn Takara detailed the problems confronting students of color and especially African Americans in American higher education. The institutional and individual biases, stereotypes, and insensitivity on campus are compounded by problems in the realities of their larger socioeconomic world. She noted the impact on her personal life and work and on those of her students. Perhaps most poignant and discouraging was the sense that not much had changed in the two decades she had been in Hawai'i, as shown by her comparison of reactions to her published views in 1971 and the "fury" directed against Trask some twenty years later.

David Stannard provided a thoroughgoing critique of racism with an analysis that distinguished among "dominative," "aversive," and "institutional" varieties. As his title ("Which Side Are You On") indicates, his basic intent was to provoke the "well-meaning, but cowardly liberal" into abandoning observer status and jumping into the fray. Stannard suggested that a *de*scriptive version of the university would reveal it fulfilling precisely the role it has been assigned: perpetuating the status quo and, for "mediocre state universities such as this one," preparing students to become unthinking cogs in the corporate world. On the other hand, a *pre*scriptive reading of what the university ought to be would necessitate the continuous exposure of the racism embedded in the present as well as the past and making a commitment to active resistance.

This session was eerily reminiscent of similar public encounters in the late 1960s and early 1970s, when faculty and

students clashed over approaches to ending the war in Southeast Asia and racism in the United States. We had, then, the earnest appeals, like the one provided by Takara, for recognition of the injustices and the pain inflicted upon the victims and an implicit call for some kind of moral recognition and action to redress the situation. Her approach assumes the fundamental willingness of people, especially people with a stake in the status quo, to participate in reforms which might jeopardize their own well-being. Stannard, in a radically different approach, assumes that most administrators and faculty understand and in fact support the status quo, and calls upon the small number of liberals who might be prodded into joining a relentless struggle to undermine the corrupt infrastructure of the university.

Drechsel and Henningsen are examples of the "well-meaning" liberals Stannard would attempt to persuade. They are clearly arrayed against the forces which would support "dominative" or even "aversive" racism. But for the Native Hawaiians and others who use the category of racism, however much "fantasy" it might be in reality, their papers could be interpreted as yet another in a series of defensive attempts to blunt the cutting edge of radical change. In this interpretation, Drechsel's call to abandon the concept of race and Henningsen's appeal to look to more basic sources of injustice are little more than self-serving measures to protect White privilege by deflecting the move towards exposing the truth and reclaiming power. This, it seems to me, would be an unfortunate reading, both intellectually and strategically.

Drechsel calls for an end to the use of the concept of race in order to deny it as a weapon in the arsenal of those who would use it to justify racism. More important, in the context of the Peace Institute fora, he would warn those who fight racism to avoid being trapped in the "same kind of black-and-white categorizing and ideology." He would have us use, instead, terms like population or ethnic group to defuse the situation and allow for constructive dialogue.

Henningsen would have us abandon race as "an ideologically constructed fantasy land." At the university level, he suggests we have an obligation (intellectual and moral) to expose the origins and impact of this concept and, simultaneously, to teach the plurality and richness of human diversity. In this way, Henningsen maintains, we can avoid the "recriminations and counter recriminations [which] will imprison us forever in a past we want to overcome."

For those who want a real flavor of the evening's proceedings, it will be necessary to view the videotapes recorded by Nā Maka o ka 'Āina (Puhi Pau and Joan Buering), because much of the significance of the issue surfaced as angry reactions. These reactions, by the way, were not random. Dozens of individuals, many of them students associated with the Hawaiian Studies Center, queued up to express their rage at the institutionalized ideologies and practices of the Mānoa campus. Henningsen became the focus, partly as an consequence of Stannard's paper, of this rage and it became impossible to discuss the intellectual basis of the positions offered by Henningsen and Drechsel.

We rejected the impulse to halt the proceedings, which continued for several hours. At the end, all of the participants and most of the audience felt this was appropriate, not simply to allow strong feelings to be "ventilated" but because the rest of us needed to understand the depth of feeling and sense of determination on the part of Native Hawaiians on the Mānoa campus.

There was no resolution of the basic question of approach; how strategic is it to employ *race* as a category to combat racism. The "race" with which one is identified (however false the construct) is clearly important to the stance assumed. Here, the difference in approaches between Takara and Stannard may be instructive; how many people in which categories can be enlisted in the effort to change the role of the university and end the legacy of racism.

The Legacy of Racism and the Role of the University

MANFRED HENNINGSEN

AS ONE of the organizers of this series, let me say only this before I start my talk, and before I antagonize some people in the audience. This series is not an end in itself, addressing an issue that has temporarily galvanized the University of Hawai'i community and the community at large. This series is an invitation to the UH community to get out of their bunkers and ghettoes and discuss and investigate the issues in more depth and with more time. Don't wait for inspiration from the President, the Vice Presidents, or the Deans. *Remember:* they are only administrators; faculty and students are the university. And the university lives by discussion, especially of controversial issues. For that reason I personally want to thank Haunani-Kay Trask for having said some rather unusual things.

Having said that, I want to move right to the center of the controversy and spell out why I disagree with her and her followers on some major issues of the discussion. Though let me add one qualification to my disagreement. I'm not speaking about the angry and sometimes indignant tone of her and her students' statements. I admit I occasionally get unnerved by that language of rage. Yet I have found a way of dealing with my gut reaction. I ask myself the question: how would you, Manfred Henningsen, respond if you were a Hawaiian intellectual? This simple question does wonders to my emotional economy--I cool down instantly because I know that I would probably respond in a similar way. I consider anger a political virtue. The philosophers I like most, namely the ancient Greek philosophers Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, taught me that indignation and anger about unjust conditions and practices are essential for a politics rooted in justice. However, since indignation and anger do not automatically lead to justice, one has to engage in critique and reflection to accomplish that.

A lot of critical reflection is needed when it comes to the central theme of racism. Haunani-Kay Trask has made her position clear in the *Ka Leo* letter of September 19, 1990, when she writes, after having mentioned African-Americans, American Indians, and Japanese-Americans as targets of American racism:

> In fact, Mr. Carter does not understand racism at all, another common characteristic of white people. For racism is a system of power in which one racially identified group dominates another racially identified group for the advantage of the dominating group. People of color in America don't have enough power to dominate and exploit white people.

Since I'm not Hawaiian, American Indian, African-American, Japanese-American, or of any European-American background, or even an American citizen, but German, I must nevertheless share, it seems, that "common characteristic of white people not to understand racism." Well, I have some major difficulties with this type of parochial reasoning. After all, the two most murderous racist regimes in this century practiced their genocidal policies against people of their own general civilizational area and geographic hemisphere, namely Europe and Asia. These two most murderous regimes were Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. The argument I want to make--by the way, not only with Haunani-Kay Trask, but with other American and Third World scholars on racism--is that racist regimes in the twentieth century are not only white on black or brown but, for example, European on European and Asian on Asian. They were in this century Germans, against, for example, Jews and Slavs; or they were Japanese, against, for example, Chinese, Koreans, and Filipinos. And these racist regimes did not use their power solely to dominate and exploit racially identified groups. No, they killed them intentionally. The Jewish Holocaust and the mass killings of Polish and Russian civilians in World War II were not the unintended consequences of irresponsible behavior like that of Captain Cook, for example, unleashing his diseased sailors on the Hawaiian population in 1778. The German behavior was intentional and justified with a grand racist design. Let me talk specifically about the memory of the Jewish Holocaust, since it has already played a role in this controversy. (Someone compared Haunani-Kay Trask with Hitler and Ken Kipnis talked about the relatives he lost in the death camps and how that has affected his

attitudes toward Germans. I assume he would include me in this also.) I'm not introducing the subject to deflect from the American and Hawaiian situation. I'm aware that the Holocaust theme is sometimes abused in this strategic way in this country. Some Americans have come to me and said: the more movies are made about the Holocaust, the less one has to say about the legacy of American racism. But I want to speak about the impact of the Holocaust. I think the way the Holocaust has worked on German and Jewish self-understanding may add something to our debate. It certainly reminds me of the other dimensions of racism.

German behavior in the world is constantly juxtaposed with Auschwitz. It's a permanent test of German moral fitness. Whether it's German unification or the War in the Gulf, Auschwitz is used to valorize or censure German behavior. A lot of Germans who grew up after the Third Reich have internalized this approach toward their society and culture and have become self-righteously judgmental about other cultures as well. Many Germans in the Peace Movement, the Greens, and the intellectual left use the same rigorous yardstick they are measured with when they talk, for example, about the American righteous justification and conduct of the war in the Gulf or Israel's treatment of the Palestinians. These primarily younger Germans are unwilling to acknowledge or even contemplate the difference. In the case of Israel, they see behavior that disturbs them more than the deadly rhetoric and practices of Saddam Hussein. The children of the perpetrators of the Holocaust don't grant the victims their reasons and justifications. The behavior culture of both societies emerged in the aftermath of the Holocaust and became traumatically affected by the "Death Event" (Edith Wyshogrod).

It's important to remember what Germans did in the Holocaust and the other racist scenarios of extermination. The Jewish Holocaust was a project of destruction of a people with an ancient cultural history and identity. This people became reimagined by the Nazis as something else. (The same pattern was followed with regard to Poles, Russians, and Gypsies.) The Nazis reimagined the Jews as a race that could not only be biologically and genetically identified, but at the same time, they were seen as the carrier of evil. On the one hand, you had the self-understanding of a people; on the other hand, you had the repackaging of this people by the Nazis as a totally different entity. For the Jews, there existed only their own identity or their membership in the various societies they lived in. For the Nazis that Jewish self-identity was irrelevant.

For them the Jews existed only as creatures in the fantasy world of Nazi racism. And the Jews died as creatures of that world because for the Nazis there existed no world outside their own racist fantasy.

This, I think, is important to remember when talking about racism. Racism is a fantasy world projected on others. Race in itself is a useless anthropological classification. When it emerged in the eighteenth century as a classification, it seemed to make some sense of the different physical features: skin color, hair texture, shape and size of the nose, eyes, and lips. Later skull measurements were added. Scientists, intellectuals, and all kinds of ideologues who worked in the last century and the early twentieth century in these areas moved from the physical appearance level (the phenotype) to the genetic level in order to find some kind of genetic coding for what they thought were commonly shared features among genetically identifiable races. All of this is, as we now know, an ideologically constructed fantasy land. Yet what is recognized now as an ideological construct was once taught, advertised, and administered as the real thing. The historical peoples, societies, and civilizations of the world, which were structured by their own meaning stories and their own complex social systems, became reinvented as something else in reference to this ideological construct, race.

The only way to overcome this obliteration by racism is to expose the roots and the impact of the racist world creation and to restore the richness and diversity of human history and to recover the plurality of meaning stories. Exposure will be with us for some time to come. But if exposure doesn't lead to a new understanding of politics and meaning, the recriminations and counter recriminations will imprison us forever in a past we want to overcome. It is, in my view, the intellectual and moral obligation of the university to engage in this dual strategy. The universities provide an ideal environment for this to happen, since they participated in the original creation, propagation, and perpetuation of this fantasy. But remember, when we are speaking about the complicity of the university as an institution in the production of this fantasy, we are not only talking about the colonial history of the world. In the twentieth century top German scientists at German universities participated in the creation of a fantasy world that destroyed Europeans, and top Japanese scientists participated in experimental surgery and biological and chemical warfare experiments on thousands of primarily Chinese victims during World War II.

Let me add one other point: all these racist fantasies include some kind of hierarchical rank order, with one race on top and the others following a descending scale of meaning. Occasionally there are two rank orders. Jews were seen by the Nazis, for example, both as vermin and as running the world. Similarly the Americans and the Japanese traded stereotypes in their respective racist cartoons during World War II. While Americans portrayed the Japanese as monkeys and the Japanese portrayed the Americans as demons, both were suggesting that the other was reaching for global hegemony. Normally you find the simple rank order depicted on the poster that Hawaiian Studies distributed for this discussion. In the left bottom corner you see an American cartoon from 1898 which shows the newly annexed people of the United States as caricatured black children. The derogatory depiction suggests that these infantilized beings are located on the lower end of the evolution of the human species. Yet whatever the rank order, we are in a fantasy world that is produced and imposed as reality. The story of racism in America and Hawai'i is a good illustration of that. Although racism is fantasy, it is a fantasy believed in by its creators and executioners, who impose it on others and force the others to live according to that fantasy. America is a society that has been deeply infested by a variety of racist fantasies in which Indians, Africans, Hawaiians, Jews, and Asians played major roles. Genocidal removal of Indians, the slavery of Africans, and the postslavery apartheid system were certainly historically the most important racist features of the WASP hegemony in America from 1600 to the 1950s.

Seeing the legacy of this racism at work in the United States, I still have difficulties accepting the general definition of American racism being equal to whites in power. Power in America may have always been white up to this historical day. Yet when Haunani-Kay Trask says in her famous letter that

> racism is a system of power in which one racially identified group dominates and exploits another racially identified group for the advantage of the dominant group,

she collapses two distinct phenomena, the *haole* and power, into one. Recognizing that those two phenomena have gone together does not mean that they are identical.

Racial appearance was and still may be in America and Hawai'i an advantageous, even a necessary, condition for power.

But it is not the origin or the source of power. If that were the case all people of color--whatever this totalizing or inverted racist terminology may mean anyway--who get positions of power must undergo a process of decolorization. (I know all the epithets and insults that are used for "people of color" who have become powerful.) In contrast to Haunani-Kay Trask, I don't think that political and economic power follow from the color of your skin. Different criteria come into play. It isn't enough to be the leader of a racially discriminating or discriminated constituency. When you follow the local debate on "Leasehold Condo Conversion" and read Bishop Estate trustee Oswald Stender's and Lt. Gov. Ben Cayetano's statements in last Sunday's newspaper (*Honolulu Advertiser-Star Bulletin*, February 24, 1991), you have a marvelous illustration. Two representatives of power are dealing with an issue of power and dressing it up in such a way that Ben Cayetano sounds like Larry Laudan and Oswald Stender like Haunani-Kay Trask. The power issues are encoded in race talk. Even Haunani-Kay Trask must have gotten a kick out of Stender's race rhetoric. After all, if Bishop Estate trustees begin to sound like Haunani-Kay Trask it will not take that long for her to become accepted as one of them. If and when that happens, she will discover that the then non-*haole* holders of power, among them a possible Governor Ben Cayetano, will be impervious to the charges of racism. If they should find it, somewhen in the future, politically necessary to dismantle the Bishop Estate they would begin to do so. That would not only be the beginning of the end of the Bishop Estate, it would be the end of the use of racism for political and other purposes as well. Confronted with raw power, we will have to return to the primary language of politics, namely that of justice and meaning.

Why don't we begin *now*?

"Which Side Are You On?"

DAVID E. STANNARD

THE TITLE of this forum tonight is "The Legacy of Racism and the Role of the University." That seems straightforward enough. Unless you look at those words very closely. If you do, what you find is that--with the exception of the words "the," "of," and "and"--every word in that title is problematic in one way or another: "legacy," "racism," "role," and "university." In the brief time allotted to me tonight, I'd like to take a look at those problematic words.

Let's begin with the word "legacy." That seems innocent and plain enough. Except that a legacy is a bequest--that is, it is something that was created in the past and is passed down to the present. When that "something" is racism, the implication is that the racism that exists in the present was not created in the present, but is a kind of lingering, though fading residue from the bad old days. And as long as that is the way racism is viewed, we will continue to hear from each new generation of privileged white people that they are not racist, that they bear no animosity toward people of color--and therefore that they are not responsible for the oppressed condition of most people of color in America today.

But only one form of the racism that exists today was created in the past and is ebbing away--albeit leaving its terrible legacy as a poisonous residue--as we proceed through the present and into the future. That is the form of racism that Joel Kovel, in his book *White Racism,* has called "dominative" racism. Dominative racism, in its most severe forms, gave rise to the kidnapping and forced removal of tens of millions of Africans to the continents of North and South America, where they were reduced to the status of permanent slaves--that is, to the status of property, to be bought and sold and disposed of at will. Dominative racism also gave rise to four centuries of genocidal mass murder perpetrated by Europeans and white Americans against other tens of millions of native people

in North and South and Central America. Dominative racism also gave rise to America's military conquests of Hawai'i, the Philippines, and elsewhere, since bound up with those conquests was an ideology that justified them in racial terms.

Dominative racism, in short, is the form of racism that is embedded in the active and conscious desire of one group of people to harm, to damage, and to wholly dominate another people who are regarded as racial inferiors.

All these dominative racist practices over the course of decades and centuries amounted to a reign of terror that white people waged against people of color--systematically killing them, systematically dominating them, systematically degrading them, systematically humiliating them, and systematically denying them access to even the barest necessities of life. It is in part because of the relentless power of white dominative racism that today thousands of black children in many parts of the United States are literally starving to death; it is in part because of the residue of dominative racism that a third of America's Indian children are forcefully removed from their parents each year and placed in foster homes or adoption agencies; and it is in part because of this legacy of dominative racism that a Hawaiian infant born today has approximately one chance in ten of being dead before it is one year old, compared with less than one chance in a hundred for a white child born at the same time.

But the legacy of dominative racism is only part of the story. Centuries of dominative racism have been so successful in creating a racially stratified society in America--with white people in control of everything--that actively dominative racism is no longer necessary. If anything, the fulminations of a Jesse Helms or a David Duke are now even a bit of an embarrassment for many white Americans. We no longer need to create a white supremacist society, after all. That's been done for us quite adequately by our predecessors. All we need to do now is maintain that white supremacist society. And try to keep our hands clean in the process. That is why the two characterizations that best describe the racism that now surrounds us every day, like the very air we breathe, are our own inventions: "aversive" racism and "institutional" racism.

Aversive racists no longer want to seek out and do terrible things to people of color--as their ancestors did. No, they just don't want anything to do with people of color. Of course, they will make exceptions. As long as the person of color has been properly whitewashed--that is, as long as he or she walks, talks, dresses,

eats, and generally acts white and middle-class, and of course holds properly "moderate" political views--the aversive racist may even go out of his or her way to be distantly friendly. After all, most aversive racists are self-proclaimed liberals. Some of them contribute to the ACLU. They are even fond of telling people of color (on the infrequent occasions when they talk with any) that they were "involved" in the civil rights movement, in the same way that they used to say (before it became too transparent) that some of their best friends were--just fill in the appropriate ethnic blank. (Incidentally, if everyone who now claims to have been involved in the civil rights movement really *had* been involved, there would have been no need for the movement.)

But the most important thing for aversive racists, when all is said and done, is that they be kept away from any people of color who do not openly yearn to be white--and who are understandably angry about the terrible things that white racism has done (and continues to do) to so many millions upon millions of their people. And this is why, for aversive racists, institutional racism is such a wonderful thing. For institutional racism is the mechanism that allows for the maintenance of an already established white supremacist society in which the major centers of power--such as business, government, the media, and higher education--are all effectively segregated and white-dominated, but without all the overt crudeness and violence of old-fashioned dominative racism.

Just from the standpoint of cool efficiency, a smoothly operating system of institutional racism is quite something to behold. For it embraces every aspect of life, linking them all together in a circular and mutually reinforcing network of racial oppression. Let's take a look at higher education for an example of how this works. The first thing we must recognize is that by its very nature and intent institutional racism is camouflaged: if we are to find institutional racism in higher education, we must begin to look for its roots elsewhere. So let's try looking at the American heart of darkness--money.

Since institutional racism is humming along effectively in the larger economic system, we can begin with the safe assumption that wherever we turn in America today most people of color will be earning far less than white people--even white people with comparable skills. (Nationwide, for instance, the earnings of white males are almost double those of black males with comparable training and experience--while comparably skilled blacks have approximately double the white unemployment rate.)

One result of this is residential segregation. But not based on the law--that's no longer necessary. No, residential segregation based on the institutionally racist workplace does a much more efficient and less controversial job of sorting out who can afford to live where--with results that just "happen" to result in race clustering and ghettoization (both urban and rural) for the masses of people of color.

Into those families--both white families and the families of people of color--naturally enough, children are born. Children with the same range of innate physical and intellectual abilities, regardless of race. But children who, because of the race of their discriminated-against parents, are segregated by the nation's economic machine into school systems that are grossly disproportionate in terms of the facilities that are available and in terms of the general level of teaching competence that is provided. That is, while no doubt there are some excellent teachers in poverty-stricken schools, in general the best qualified teachers seek out--and are rewarded with--positions in the most affluent schools. Thus, the predictable self-fulfilling prophecy goes to work. The residual ideology of dominative racism is that white people view themselves as innately more intelligent than people of color; while that ideology is no longer publicly fashionable--thanks to the tremendous struggles of people of color for decades to demonstrate its falsity--the existing institutionally racist economic relationships of the society result much more often than not in the provision of grossly inferior elementary and high school educations for people of color. In particular, young people of color--who are disproportionately represented among the poor in America--tend to do less well than do young white people on such measures of achievement as the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Of course, student scores on the SAT repeatedly have been shown to be not only susceptible to dramatic upward alteration if test-takers have the financial wherewithal to take special SAT preparation courses, they also show--across the board--a remarkable statistical correlation with parental income. That is, given a sufficiently large test group, SAT scores can be predicted with remarkable accuracy based on only one statistical variable: high test scores correlate with high parental income, and low test scores correlate with low parental income.

The overall result of this is that these widely used so-called "objective" tests in fact serve to ratify the racist expectations of a racist society by routinely certifying white children as measurably more intelligent than children of color--although the causes of such

fabricated differences are plainly traceable (at the very least) to an institutionally racist nationwide workplace within which such children's parents ply their trades. In sum, the circle keeps closing on itself--with just enough exceptions slipping through (that is, the occasional dark-skinned child who is so superior that he or she beats the odds) that the system becomes self-validating.

The long-term result of such machinations is that very few people of color make it into even the undergraduate realm of higher education in America. And this permits representatives of the university--let's say, for the sake of argument, a Professor of Philosophy--to announce that he would love to hire as a colleague someone from an underrepresented racial minority group, but that there just aren't any qualified applicants. Rarely is this in fact true. Indeed, in most of the incidents I have witnessed in recent years, the rejected applicants who have been people of color also have been superior scholars to the old-line tenured white faculty who have turned them away. But, for the sake of argument, let's assume that in the present hypothetical case there are no qualified applicants who are people of color. What happens next? With no further thought about *why* there are no qualified applicants (or what he or his department or the university might do about this supposed fact) our professedly liberal professor then breathes a sigh of relief and mops his brow--relieved that his private professional club will remain melanin-free--and then goes back to his rarified study of, let us say, ethics.

Thus the dark-skinned students become undereducated dark-skinned adults who are discriminated against in an institutionally racist workplace--soon bringing into the world still another generation of dark-skinned children. And the prophetically self-fulfilling cycle begins again--each turn of the generational wheel further marginalizing people of color and further convincing dark-skinned victims and light-skinned victimizers alike that a white supremacist society is the natural order of things. Thus, poverty for people of color remains entrenched; thus, misery for people of color remains entrenched; and--among other measures of a racist society's denial of human services to those it deems less than deserving because of the color of their skin--thus the corpses of dark-skinned dead babies continue to pile up because aversive white racists don't care.

As I said, institutional racism is a very smooth operator. There is very little that it cannot abide. But one of those things is the occasional dark-skinned malcontent who is intelligent and

determined enough to make it into the university--and then bold enough to publicly expose the university's institutionally racist ways of working.

Because of the efficiency of institutional racism, such people are few and far between. At the worst--as far as the university's army of aversive racist white faculty are concerned--such people are supposed to stick around only long enough to be weeded out under one false pretense or another in the tenure process. But if somehow they slip through--because their scholarship and teaching and service make a tenure denial effectively impossible--there is going to be hell to pay. For the beneficiaries of institutional racism at the university are like the proverbial emperor who had no clothes, or the Wizard of Oz: the worst thing that can happen to them is exposure of their racist pretense, exposure of their institutionalized mendacity.

And this leads us to the problematic nature of those last two words in the title of this forum--"Role" and "University." What is problematic about those words is, quite simply, whether they are read descriptively or prescriptively. Descriptively, the sad role of the university is to recapitulate within its walls the institutional racism and other forms of numskulled adherence to the status quo that prevail throughout the society. For mediocre state universities such as this one, that means preparing the next generation of unthinking intellectual cannon fodder for the world of corporate enterprise that is waiting to employ our human "products."

Thus, *de*scriptively, this university, under its current Babbit-like leadership, is fulfilling precisely its intended role. But if we take a more high-minded view and consider the role of the university *pre*scriptively--that is, as the one moment in most people's lives when they can think about what ought to be rather than what is--when they can plan how to make the world of the future a safer and fairer and more equitable world for all of us, and for our children and grandchildren, rather than as a place merely to advance a selfish personal agenda--then this university's relentlessly racist and relentlessly status quo-affirming leadership is a bankrupt and abysmal failure.

The university is the one place where the logjam of institutional racism can be broken, sending a rush of freedom-affirming power into every stream and tributary of American social life. But breaking a logjam is dangerous. It risks bringing on the wrath of those who built it in the first place. And when those who run a university (and their friends in certain departments) are both aversive racists and careerist cowards, we can be confidently

assured that change will have to swell upward from below.

This means that we shall have to break the silence that muffles what should be the teaching of our shameful history of genocide and our ferocious past of dominative racism--just as we shall have to continue to expose the insidious aversive and institutional racism that to this day intentionally bars the doors of this university to underprivileged people of color. For one symptom of the modern, institutionally racist university is the determined concealment of the ferocious and violent racism of America's past--through the simple process of curricular excision--and sleight of hand efforts to distract attention away from the slick institutional racism of the present.

One way this is done is by simplemindedly redefining racism as any expressed attitude of anger or antipathy directed toward another racial group--disregarding the cause of such anger or antipathy, and disregarding the absence of the two core principles of racism: that is, a belief in the other's racial inferiority and the systematic taking of action against that racial group. With these two traditional definitional principles eliminated, any *victim* of white racism who protests his or her victimization, and in the process expresses a generalization about the oppressor's racial identification-by making the irrefutably correct statement, for example, that in Hawai'i *haole* systematically have oppressed Hawaiians for more than 150 years and that Hawaiians would benefit from one less such *haole* in these islands--gets him- or herself saddled with a charge of racism.

This, of course, is perverse, Alice-in-Wonderland logic with a vicious political intent. It has the same function as the charge of "reverse discrimination" against a policy of affirmative action that is designed as a *corrective* against racism--or the charge of "political correctness" against an effort to seek fair *redress* of grievances. In all these cases, what can be seen at work is the effort of people holding positions of illegitimate power--power that is based on a historical foundation of both dominative and institutional racism--fending off criticisms of their ill-gotten gains by charging their critics with the very crimes of which they themselves, and their predecessors, are guilty.

However general and abstract our discussion of these subjects may become this evening, we must not forget the events that brought this occasion into being. An institutionally privileged man--institutionally privileged because he is white and male--wrote a column in a student newspaper complaining about alleged limitations placed on his unearned privilege by some people who are the

battered victims of his people's ongoing dominative, aversive, and institutional racism. Not only did his complaint demonstrate an abysmal, though typical, lack of historical knowledge, it contained a demand that Hawaiians in effect refrain from fully speaking their own language in his presence.

In reply, a woman of color whose people were almost exterminated by that young man's ancestors--and whose people continue to live an oppressed Third World existence within the confines of a white dominated, militarily conquered, and politically occupied land base--wrote to inform that privileged man that his comments were ignorant and immoral, and that because of that, she regarded him as one of many unwelcome interlopers in her people's ancestral land.

The white supremacists on this campus could not tolerate such uppitiness. They are pleased to teach in a university that systematically denies access to underprivileged people of color. They are pleased to teach in a university that ghettoizes its Ethnic Studies and Hawaiian Studies programs with inadequate facilities, while providing red carpets for a trade school for tourism hucksters. They are pleased to teach in a university whose Law School panders to local politicos in its admissions procedures. They are pleased to teach in a university that names the building housing its Social Science disciplines, Porteus Hall, in honor of a famous pseudoscientific racist--as though Stanford University were to proudly name a new school the William Shockley School for Genetic Research.

But these very same people cannot abide the outspokenness of someone who says it is wrong to trivialize genocide, who says it is wrong to urge a papering over of gut-wrenching and ongoing racist oppression in the interests of mindless, New Age, institutionally racist warm fuzziness for white people. They cannot abide that outspokenness, quite simply, because it threatens the easy comforts of their institutionalized, segregated, aversive white racist security.

This is a moment of great importance for the University of Hawai'i. Particularly so for white people of good will. The Hawaiians and other people of color will continue to push ahead, as they have for years, to ban every form of white racism from this campus. They will be here long after names like Albert Simone and Larry Laudan and Richard Miller have faded into well-deserved obscurity. But those of you self-professed white liberals--some of whom have taken me and others aside to express your dismay and disapproval over the racist McCarthyism that recently has been

unleashed on this campus with the president's blessing--and who then proceed to keep your mouths glued shut at Faculty Senate meetings while the Philosophy Department and Law School yahoos spew out their venomous bile--what are we to make of you? For ultimately, on campuses in the 1950s, as on campuses today, it has always been the silence of the well-meaning, but cowardly liberal that has nailed shut the coffin containing the corpse of free speech and academic freedom.

The forces of racism and reaction have laid down their charge. For the good of this university's future, if for nothing else, it's up to the rest of us now to decide--and to announce publicly--which side we are on.

Thank you.

The Politics of Survival

KATHRYN WADDELL TAKARA

THE UNIVERSITY is an establishment or corporation for the purpose of instruction in all or some of the *important* sciences and literatures. But who is to determine what is important, whose taste counts, what is of value? It is evidently the people in power both within and out of the university who control and regulate the training camp of the future, which must of course protect their interests. Unfortunately, the legacy of racism continues to taint the university.

When one thinks of the word "legacy," one thinks of something of value, like money or property, being handed down from one generation or group to another. However, racism is a burden and a handicap that includes narrow visions and constricting arbitrary attitudes of intolerance of difference.

Racism is neither love, justice, nor democracy. It permeates and distorts philosophy, science, art, aesthetics, the social sciences (history, political science, sociology), and intelligence tests, and gives birth to innumerable stereotypes.

At the university, racism creates a climate full of obstacles for both students and teachers: isolation, social alienation, invisibility, fears about competence, hostility, and rejection. It spawns insecure attitudes and behavior. In addition, it exacerbates the cultural barriers and creates negative expectations.

In speaking about minority students of color, and African American students in particular, one cannot ignore the systematic historical exclusion of the majority from the echelons of superior academic performance and subsequent economic success in life. When faculty members ignore the reality of institutional racism and the covert and overt racism that plagues African American communities, particularly visible in the school system, they perpetuate a type of socially sanctioned violence against these young people. It is a fact supported by shocking statistics that racism blights the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of its victims. It stunts the practical learning skills necessary for providing for self and

family, and often leads to crime and the self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. The racial and gender biases, the stereotypes and relegation to powerless and insignificant participation, are a burden to its victims.

Since most African Americans major in education, the social sciences, and the humanities, these fields of study should be more culturally informed to encourage success among their students and minimize obstacles of difference, thereby affirming and accepting minority students' cultural and racial distinctiveness. Unfortunately the reality is that many students, in particular African American students, are ignored or not taken seriously by peers and professors alike. Too often they are called on only to address racial or ethnic issues like crime, unwed mothers, drugs, and the like.

The effects are predictable for anyone who cares enough to reflect. The obvious psychological damage is that too often minority students are not encouraged as much as are their more articulate white peers. Minority students sometimes perform less in class due to self-consciousness of their difference, dialect, or inexperience, and negative expectations of their professors and peers. This in turn may result in the negative consequence of their not honing their speaking skills, since they do not receive positive reinforcement or affirmation from the professor. Also minority students characteristically receive less attention from professors outside of class; they may be brushed off during office hours, which are sometimes devoted to personal work and favored students.

There are other obstacles: some professors don't expect much from black students, readily accept an average performance, and do little to push the student to excellence, a certain requirement for further study in graduate or professional school. Not only are a majority of African American students not encouraged or pushed to develop intellectual competence and leadership, but many professors remain uninformed about African American culture, the community and the requirements for survival, and the obstacles to education in many households and ethnic communities. Unaware of these stumbling blocks, the professors don't refer students to available assistance: help in reading, learning skills, computer labs, tutors, scholarships, grants, travel opportunities, and so on.

How many professors stop to think of the special problems and demands of college athletes, who are one of the most exploited groups on campus, expected to fulfill Herculean demands: be full-time students and outstanding full-time athletes in order to keep their scholarships and get an education? How many athletes and

professors are aware of the statistics of success and failure for professional athletes, the high dropout rate after the sports season, the misunderstood contracts, the illusive dream where less than 1 percent succeed to the professional level, and even then the attrition rate is high?

In ghetto communities, where many of these young people come from, there are emotional and social problems that impact on their friends and families with suffering and violence, sometimes unto death. Where are the successful black role models for young men and women, other than entertainers and athletes? One out of every 250 black athletes graduates from predominantly white colleges.

It therefore becomes imperative for the faculty to become aware of these problems and to address them. For the minority student athlete, valuing education must be cultivated through an institutional commitment to insure that they do graduate. Academic success must be stressed and reinforced by caring and competent advisers.

It is easy and convenient to ignore these minority students, assuming that they are all athletes who don't value or want rigorous scholarship, knowledge, and understanding, but want only a career in the pros. It is easy to say "it's not my problem." But minority students need encouragement, understanding, support, success, and perhaps most importantly, someone to believe in them, since many come from such dispossessed environments. Even if they are not economically hindered, they can still be emotionally crippled due to a racist society full of illusions, hypocrisy, denial, and deprivation.

Professors also often vacillate between under- and overattention, assuming black students can only contribute when the subjects require ethnic analysis. Most blacks don't want to be representatives of the entire group; many have never had the opportunity to study black history, culture, inventors, or philosophy; but yes, almost all have been victimized by the American system.

Unfortunately, it is a fact that most faculty refuse to confront their own racial attitudes; why should we expect students to do so? Professors use subtle and not so subtle racial, gender, and ethnic slurs in class and with their colleagues. Professors are too often not role models for their Third World students. They seem smug, arrogant, uninformed, materialistic, and ethnocentric. They are often aggressively supportive and defensive of middle-class values and white privilege.

Consequently, the minority student in general and the African American student in particular is underserved, a victim of a materialist system full of guilt and neglect over the sorry legacy of slavery and racism. A majority of these students cannot afford the spiraling costs of four-year institutions. Those who can attend are often insulted by insinuations that they are only admitted due to affirmative action, which in the racial tradition devalues their intelligence. Others are nonconventional students who are older and take longer to complete their studies. The delay in completing their college education is often due to community and family commitments, since many are single parents or married with young children. These extended allegiances and responsibilities are often reflections of their cultural values. Still others must hold several jobs and struggle to balance their academic and family responsibilities in order to help their immediate or extended families. It is common for these students to have to work and go to school, catch the bus, and live in crowded lodgings not conducive to good study habits or adequate rest.

For the minority student the politics of survival incorporates accommodation, assimilation, and suppression of rage at his or her invisibility and isolation. It includes a host of emotions: insecurity, pain, fear of rejection and failure, and sometimes a smouldering rage. On the campus there is little reinforcement or sense of a dynamic and united community in their lives that would provide them with nurturing from an awareness of community support. The feeling is one of being misunderstood, ignored, and disrespected.

There is another obstacle facing many Third World students: economics. There is no college fund from the parent(s) who struggle(s) to keep food on the table, often for a number of children. There is often no health insurance, no car, no home with a yard, no pets, no books, no magazines, no typewriter, no computer, and so on. Their reality is qualitatively and quantitatively different.

Contrary to the mythology of American education being egalitarian and meritocratic, the content of the curriculum is still uninformed. There is a disproportionate lack of diversity of perspectives in many disciplines and at all levels, from elementary school through the university system. This homogeneity largely ignores the multicultural component of the American population. This condition translates into a social problem, especially when minority groups continue to be trivialized, marginalized, devalued, and made to seem irrelevant to the growth and progress of America.

What is education? Is it about how to earn money or how to learn about values, principles, community, caring, creating a more just society, improving the world?

In response to [University of Hawai'i dean of social sciences] Dean Richard Dubanoski's recent memo to the chairs and directors of the College of Social Sciences affirming the value of collegiality (which included the three basic elements of mutual respect, open communication, and teamwork), I would suggest that faculty and students also strive to affirm and work to enhance these three elements.

Realistically, this philosophy does not exist between faculty and students. The contributions of minorities to society are ignored or trivialized. Faculty are slow to give the extra time, help, encouragement and consideration to minority or slow students, preferring those who are brightest, most articulate, most likely to succeed. Perhaps they are too preoccupied with the demands on their own lives to notice a floundering minority student who may be too self-conscious to speak up in class, or come to office hours. Perhaps the student may be slow to read due to undiagnosed dyslexia, poor training, or some trauma. These students, often alienated and insecure, are the very ones who need to be validated on the individual and group level. They need their self-esteem built up or reinforced.

In order to incorporate meaning for them in the university environment, professors might strive to include some of their ethnic history, culture, heroes and heroines, literary figures, tales, inventors, theorists, scientists, and intellectuals into the curriculum. This could be a learning process for the faculty members as well. A part of education should be to provide information and inspiration, role models, and cultural connections outside the dominant group.

Unfortunately, in order to fit into the university environment, students feel that the vibrant spirit of ethnic identity, nationalism, and revolutionary ideas must be sanitized, left behind, or hidden. The burning desire and fire to transform society into a more just and equal one is quenched through lack of interest and support. The aim of minority students for empowerment and status also seems thwarted by the demigods of privilege. Radical race and class analysis by nonwhites is seen as threatening, consciousness raising, without validity or rigorous scholarship. Perspectives on Africa are totally ignored and made to seem inappropriate and threatening to the status quo, even though well-known ancient Greek scholars studied there.

Minority students also desperately need mentors in the form of professors and graduate students to provide intellectual and environmental stimulation, support, and technical skills.

A sincere commitment by the university to minorities will be reflected in its curriculum and support services and help to rectify the sense of anomie. It will also lead to a more harmonious, nurturing learning environment.

As an African American instructor I can verify that racism and sexism have hindered my academic goals and success. Like many women on campus I too have returned to teach and study with two children and two jobs. I have been attacked verbally, directly and indirectly, because of my color and gender. I have been accused of a lack of scholarship and unconventional teaching methods. I have been slandered for "consciousness raising," saying the only reason I have my job is because I am an African American woman. It is of little consequence that the reality of the African American experience has been one of oppression, racism, alienation, and activism. It is implied that these are neither scholarly nor legitimate issues to bring to the classroom, yet everyday on television we are bombarded with negative images of black crime, violence, poverty, and stereotypes. Are we not to analyze this condition and try to understand?

My numerous free lectures to the community through the years have been trivialized and I have been constantly overlooked when significant African American scholars and other scholars with minority interests have been brought to the university. Yet I am proud to say that through the years my courses have been full and students return or write to thank me for helping them to grow, to inform and expand their reality, their sense of identity, culture, and community.

In 1971, I wrote an article in *Honolulu Magazine* entitled "To Be Black in Paradise: The Myth of Racial Harmony in Hawai'i," which created a tumultuous reaction among the readers due to my analysis of racism and exploitation, especially against African Americans and Hawaiians. In the letters to the editor in subsequent editions, I was invited by *kama'āina* to go back to America, since Hawai'i had no race problems. Admittedly I was but a *malihini*, uninformed perhaps, but nonetheless sensitive to the subtle and not so subtle manifestations of both racism and exploitation. Therefore, I was not surprised when twenty years later there is a similar fury against Dr. Haunani-Kay Trask's analysis of gender, race, and class exploitation in Hawai'i.

My experiences at the University of Hawai'i have not embittered me, but they have made me more determined to succeed and stay. After twenty years I am still not tenured, still trying to complete my Ph.D. degree, and still teaching several courses in more than one institution. Being African American at UHM one can still be misunderstood, devalued, psychologically abused, and occasionally intimidated.

As a woman of color, I ask the following questions: Who encourages us? Who investigates our complaints? Who judges? How many of them are people of color? How many are women? How many are of the powerless minorities? How many are African Americans?

The present situation at the university is that a majority of the student population are nonwhite and a majority of professors and administrators are white males. I feel there is a serious sense of dislocation, underrepresentation, imbalance, and a resulting cynicism.

To move forward we need to implement remedies, policies, and mechanisms, and hire people for the recruitment and retention of bright and talented minority students. We must do these things with the same zeal and commitment that we use when we recruit our overworked athletes. We must not be afraid of our differences and diversity. To create and affirm ethnic harmony in Hawai'i, we must leave fear behind.

The Invalidity of the Concept of "Race"*

EMANUEL J. DRECHSEL

0. FOLLOWING a long tradition in the natural and social sciences including early anthropology, people have regularly divided humanity into three, four, or more major populations called "races," i.e. groups of people with apparently distinct physical characteristics. Hence, there have been proposals for typological distinctions between Africans, Europeans, Asians, Pacific Islanders, and American Indians among others. A major, misused criterion for their classification has been their phenotypical appearance as evident in skin color. Other presumed "racial" features have included body build, the type and color of hair, and facial features, principally the epicanthic fold. Classifications of human physical characteristics have also focused on stereotypical congenital traits with respect to the behavior and mind of different "races," especially their aggression, sexuality, morals, work ethic, and intelligence.

Attempts at establishing "races" have answered our incessant need to categorize humans and to find ideal types among all the human variation. The notion of "race" has also been fundamental to racist ideologies, which have referred to the subject as if it were a factual entity of biology and required no reflection. But "racial" classifications have not contributed to our understanding of human variation, due in part to an ongoing confusion of biological with sociocultural aspects. It is only with modern American anthropology in the tradition of Franz Boas that we began learning to sort out sociocultural characteristics in human behavior from biological ones, and it took the development of population genetics to provide a basic understanding of human biological variation.

The following offers a review of "race" from a modern anthropological perspective, and includes findings of population genetics as recognized by biological anthropologists in their understanding of global human variation today. These ideas are by no means new, and are standard in American anthropology today.[1]

Yet "race" is in need of continued critique; emotionally charged and full of erroneous presumptions, this concept has been difficult to change or challenge in spite of massive evidence refuting its validity. Examining the invalidity of "race" ought to prove useful not only to those who regularly misquote science to justify racism, but also to those concerned about fighting it and who run the danger of being trapped in the same kind of black-and-white categorizing and ideology.

1. At a closer examination of human biological variation across continents, modern anthropologists and human biologists have found no evidence to support the classification of peoples into "races." Population genetics has in fact failed to demonstrate fundamental "racial" differences. Quite to the contrary, anthropologists have shown that crucial selective factors and adaptive forces in human evolution crisscross imagined boundaries between "races."

The prime trait for the common recognition of "racial" characteristics, namely skin color, relates to the geographic location of peoples before European exploration and colonization disturbed and radically altered their "prehistoric" distribution. Pigmentary protection in the form of a dark skin, which helps control possible damage resulting from an overload exposure to ultraviolet radiation by the sun, had originally existed only among peoples in equatorial areas, such as parts of Africa, Southeast Asia, and the South Pacific. Yet, as a phenotypical phenomenon, skin color also reflects environmental influences, evident in extensive tanning; variation in pigmentation may thus be due as much to non-genetic factors, such as the amount of exposure to the sun. While skin-color variation has been further complicated by population movements throughout human history, anthropologists have found gradients of declining skin pigmentation towards either pole. A prime example is India where, on the whole, southern residents are darker than northerners, many of whom could pass as southern Europeans in regard to their skin color. Depigmentation among peoples in temperate zones--especially in Europe, but also in northern Asia--has resulted from the long-term, increased use of clothing necessary in colder climates. The new environments radically reduced the adaptive value of epidermal melanin, the organic molecule responsible for pigmentation. Random mutations affecting the genetic background for melanin production could thus occur without any disadvantage, and increased over thousands of years of evolutionary history.

The geographical distribution of hair color overlaps with that of skin color quite closely. With advanced depigmentation, anthropologists have also found lighter colors in hair, varying between brown and blond. Similarly, the highest rate of gray hair and baldness has occurred among peoples with a long history of adaptation to temperate zones, which has required some protection for the head from cold temperatures (such as hats) and has consequently reduced the protective significance of hair as among Europeans. The shape of hair developed under similar environmental conditions, inasmuch as curly and wooly hair has provided insulation against high levels of solar radiation and heat for a vital and sensitive organ, the brain. But the *form* of hair shows no direct correlation to skin color, quite counter to popular assumption that kinky hair goes with dark skin; witness for instance the very curly hair among the only moderately pigmented Bushmen of South Africa.

Different geographic distributions apply to still other parts of the human anatomy. The size of teeth and the lower jaw is larger among nomadic hunters and gatherers than food producers (i.e. horticulturists or agriculturists), whose sedentary lifestyles have led to increased reliance on food preparation and cooking technology such as pottery. Long narrow noses, which have a kind of air-conditioning function by moistening or warming air, correlate significantly with dry environments and cold climates respectively. Body size and build reveal a close relationship to subsistence and again environment; peoples with periodic nutritional bottlenecks such as some hunters and gatherers (e.g., the so-called Pygmies in Africa, south and southeast Asia, and remote areas in Papua New Guinea) are smaller in size than groups with a regular food source (such as the slender and tall east African cattle-herders on the upper Nile or modern Americans and Europeans of diverse ethnic backgrounds). Moreover, human bulk generally increases in colder environments as among Eskimo and other northern peoples.

Most significantly, all these traits including those of skin color, hair color and form vary independently from each other in their geographic distribution, and cross geographic and population boundaries without regard to the supposed limits of particular human gene pools or breeding populations. A prime example are the very Pygmies, who have often been assumed to belong to one "race" with a history of vast migrations across the tropical world, but who exhibit few common anatomical or other shared characteristics aside from their small size; Pygmies actually vary

substantially in skin color, hair form, and shape of face so as not to warrant a conclusion of any recent common ancestry, but instead to suggest an interpretation of peoples of different origins who were subject to similar environmental restrictions.

These as well as other similarities and differences between human groups thus do not justify the assumption of biological boundaries between alleged "races," but are only phenotypical characteristics of human populations, which reflect both genetic and environmental influences over extended periods of human history.

2. If we consider genetic traits or genotypes instead, we likewise find that their distribution does not match "racial" groupings, however defined; moreover, it may still reveal the effects of earlier environmental influences. For example, color blindness is largely absent among hunters, who can ill afford to rely on reduced vision, and occurs primarily among food producers, who can make greater concessions in this regard and include Europeans, western Asians, and Chinese. Abnormal hemoglobins as in sickle-cell anemia, widely misidentified with Africans, is not exclusive to them, but is also evident among southern Europeans, as well as west, south, and southeast Asians. As recognized by Frank B. Livingstone, the distribution of sickle-cell anemia matches that of falciparum malaria, against which sickle-cell anemia with a heterozygote abnormal hemoglobin provides an adaptive advantage by reducing the amount of malarial infection (without however removing the infection or building up immunity). Significantly, the distribution of the malaria matches that of a species of mosquito that breeds in environments of slash-and-burn horticulture after heavy tropical rainfall.

Similarly, lact*o*se intolerance (also known as "lact*a*se deficiency"), the cause of cramps and diarrhea among many adults, is not unique to Asians counter to common belief, but occurs among other peoples on the globe as well. Conversely, lact*a*se, an enzyme that breaks down the sugar lact*o*se, is present among most northwestern European populations and among certain peoples of Africa and India, and is clearly tied to their established use of milk and dairy products as staple foods. The very phenomenon of lactose intolerance, although genetically determined, may in part have been conditioned by the environment inasmuch as the continued use of milk after infancy among peoples with a long dietary tradition of dairy products keeps stimulating lactase secretion.

Still other characteristic genetic traits such as blood types are not in accord with any "racial" classifications. Instead, differences in ABO blood types seem to be related to distinct dietary traditions among peoples, and again reflect environmental influences. Somebody in need of a blood transfusion hence should not be concerned about whether he or she receives blood from a member of the same "race," but about the compatibility of the donor's and receiver's blood types to avoid agglutination or clumping with fatal consequences.

The concept of "race" becomes even more problematic in the use of so-called intelligence tests, which--counter to unsupported claims by Arthur Jensen--do not account for biological or genetic differences, but measure acquired knowledge, linguistic skills, motivation, socialization, and acculturation, and do so poorly even in this function. The sociocultural biases of intelligence tests are so obvious and extensive as to deserve no further comments here.[2]

3. Internal variation in a population can be the result of a variety of factors: genetic drift or spontaneous random variations in gene frequency, mutations, and--most significantly--gene flow, i.e. the dissemination of genes from one population to another by interbreeding. For such to occur, it takes only a single individual from one community to have fertile offspring with a member of the opposite sex in another.

From a historical perspective, the idea of a human population reproducing in isolation is a sociobiological illusion of racial purists. Gene flow is not a phenomenon unique to the jet age, the modern era, or even post-Columbian times, but has regularly occurred throughout human history and at times over great geographic distances, as anthropologists have demonstrated for peoples all over the globe. Peoples of the Old World have willy-nilly kept ties with each other from one end to another via a chain of interrelated gene pools, and have rarely lost contact for any extended evolutionary periods. Even Native Americans were never entirely isolated from peoples of Asia or Europe in pre-Columbian times. Counter to common assumptions, Aleuts, Eskimos, and American Indians maintained connections with northeastern Asia across the Bering Strait throughout "prehistoric" times in spite of a rising sea level and disappearing land bridge. In addition, there existed pre-Columbian contacts between North America and Europe as evident, for instance, in "prehistoric" visits to northeastern Indians by Vikings

and Basques. Similarly, it is difficult to imagine that the extraordinary navigational skills of Micronesians and Polynesians prevented them from paying regular visits across much of the Pacific. Humanity in reality has been, and has remained, a single large population.

4. There is a major element in human evolution that however does not apply to animals, let alone plants, and that significantly influences human populations in their similarities and differences. This uniquely human characteristic is culture, i.e. the system of learned behavior and values shared by a community. Those insisting on the concept of "race" have continuously confused external, frequently superficial, aspects of human biological variation with sociocultural or learned phenomena, including presumptions of how people perceive and react to these. To the extent that the concept of "race" is applicable to any human population, we deal with a sociocultural entity rather than a biological one. It is differences perceived in terms of particular cultural standards--at times minimal characteristics such as hair style, the presence or absence of facial hair among men, and ways of dressing--instead of genetic facts by which communities have defined a particular "race" in contrast to another. Other definitions of "race" have inadvertently included elements of culture--namely diet, subsistence, technology, economy, ideology, etc.--as significant or even exclusive factors. Ultimately, the concept of culture like "race" must be understood as an open system of behavior and traditions subject to outside influences. Even in presumably sealed societies, ranging from the unfairly maligned Neanderthalers and small-scale "primitive" communities to Nazi Germany, there always existed individuals who maintained contacts with the outside world with consequences of both a biological and sociocultural nature.

5. In recognition of these basic facts, the concept of "race" is misleading rather than clarifying or otherwise helpful in our understanding of human variation. This notion hides the fact that there is as much genetic variation within a "race" as between "races," and misses significant environmental and sociocultural influences in the biological makeup of any human group. The available evidence on human biological variation thus does not lend any support to conventional perceptions of "races," whether defined in purely biological terms or as sociobiological entities.

For these reasons, prominent biological anthropologists, among them especially Ashley Montagu, have suggested that the concept of "race" be abandoned altogether. They have come to realize on the basis of well-founded linguistic reasons that it is much more difficult to change the meaning and implications of an established and emotionally charged term than simply to replace it with a new concept such as *population* or *ethnic group*. Neither of these concepts holds the unjustifiable, even misguided presumptions of "race;" for *population* clearly implies open biological boundaries, and *ethnic group* recognizes the influence of culture.

To object to the concept of "race" and its unjustified presumptions is not to deny biological differences among humans or racism, but to reject the idea that these differences are so great or significant as to justify social boundaries and discrimination. If we do not abandon our misconceptions about human variation as evident in "race," we remain prisoners of "the myth of race" (Ashley Montagu) and--with it--of our very racist heritage. The continued use of "race" and its many unsubstantiated implications only provide fuel to racist thinking.

NOTES

* This essay is the complete and slightly revised version of my oral presentation, which I abridged due to pressures of time. I would like to express my appreciation to my wife Teresa Haunani Makuakāne-Drechsel, Peter Manicas, and Thomas W. Maretzki, who made valuable suggestions. The responsibility for what follows, as a matter of course, remains entirely my own.

1. The following discussion relies substantially on Chapter 11 of *Human Evolution: An Introduction to Biological Anthropology* by C. L. Brace and Ashley Montagu, 2d edition (New York: Macmillan, 1977). For a comprehensive review of "race" and racism, see also others of Montagu's many writings on the topic, especially his *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, 5th edition, revised and enlarged (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974).

2. A most useful source on this issue is Stephen Jay Gould's *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1981), a book on the abuse of science in support of biological determinism, as applied especially in craniometry and intelligence testing.

FORUM 5

The Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University

March 7, 1991

MODERATOR

Donald M. Topping

PANELISTS

Farideh Farhi

David Gegeo

Norman Jackson

Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa

Noel Kent

Introduction

DONALD M. TOPPING

WHEN I was asked to serve as moderator for this evening's panel, I accepted the invitation with some hesitation, mainly because I generally avoid engaging in public debate. I like time to think things through before I offer my own thoughts.

However, the topic was a compelling one for me, since I have spent most of my life in the colonial world of the Pacific, and have already given a lot of thought to what I have seen going on around me. As a matter of fact, my life in the Pacific began as a colonialist in the first colonized island in the Pacific: Guam (1569).

My own mea culpa story begins in 1956, the year I first went to Guam as a teacher of English. It was only after I had been working in this capacity for nearly a year that I came to understand that my assignment was really that of teaching brown people how to think like white people. After all, the language that we think in shapes the way we think. As an English teacher at the Territorial College of Guam I served as one of the many instruments of language change, from Chamorro to English. I even helped make signs that read "English Only Spoken Here," in naive belief that speaking Chamorro hindered progress in learning English.

The turnabout in my own thinking began when I tried to learn something of the language and the people I was teaching. That proved enlightening and resulted in changing my orientation, thinking, and career, from the teaching of English to the study of Pacific languages and people, and the ongoing effort to stem the tide of linguistic and cultural erosion and eradication, which is the ultimate goal of colonialism.

Now I am using this term colonialism rather freely, when I'm not even sure what the term means to all of us. To some it is the appropriation of territory. It usually includes the subjugation, physical or intellectual, of minority cultures. But in all cases, I think, it includes the exploitation of one people by another.

As I know colonialism--exploitation--in the Pacific, it is not an exclusively white man's enterprise. I have seen Yapese exploit Ulithians; Palauans using Sonsorolese; Fijians dominating Rotumans; Chamorros exploiting Trukese and most other Micronesians, and now Filipinos. And if we look to the larger Pacific countries, we cannot overlook the Japanese treatment of Koreans and Okinawans, and the Hispanics of Peru exploiting the Quechua and the indigenous people of Rapa Nui. Colonialism is not the exclusive province of the Caucasian race, even though they have undoubtedly done more than their fair share, particularly in the Pacific islands.

Over the years the face of colonialism has changed. In the old days colonizing governments sent out troops and colonial governors; now the tactic is to support indigens who have been intellectually and morally colonized. In the old days land areas were seized by military force (Puerto Rico, Philippines, Hawai'i, and so on); now it is accomplished through multinational corporations, federally funded programs, and puppet governments. However, the traditional method of colonizers is still practiced, as in the most recent experiences of Grenada, Panama, and the Persian Gulf: military conquest. So although the face of colonialism may have changed, it is still alive and well in today's world.

Does colonialism still exist here in Hawai'i? That is the question we have gathered here this evening to examine. Some of our speakers this evening have lived on the receiving end of the colonial experience, and I am sure they will gladly share some of their perceptions with us. Others have been observers, critics, and like myself, may have once been a part of the colonial process, albeit unwittingly.

Before we turn our attention to the invited speakers, let us remind ourselves of the aim of this series of public fora, for which we have the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace and its leadership to thank. The tradition of the public forum is to provide time and space for concerned people to meet, express ideas, and listen to those of others, and, hopefully, to learn something new.

Back to the question of this forum: Is there institutional colonialism in Hawai'i? In our university? Are we still living with and perpetuating the legacy of colonialism to which a large number of people living in these islands may be blind? Perhaps a more pertinent question is: Can the institutions really correct themselves?

These are the questions we should bear in mind as we listen to our speakers this evening, both invited and volunteers.

The Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University: A Native Hawaiian Point of View

LILIKALĀ KAME'ELEIHIWA

'AE, E NĀ 'Aumākua o ka pō
e nā 'Aumākua o ke ao
'O 'Uli ku'u kupuna wahine
'O Haumea ku'u kumu mana
'O Pele ko'u Akua lā e
'O Kānehekili Akua kama'āina
'O Lonomakua ho'ā i ke ahi
'O Kū, 'o Kūho'one'enu'u e
E mōlia i nā kolea 'aihue 'āina
E mōlia i nā haole 'aihue aupuni
E mōlia i nā kānaka ho'ohewa lāhui Hawai'i e
Eia ka mōhai ho'opāna'i
'O ke kānaka 'ino
'O ka wahahe'e
'O ka ho'okae 'ana i ka lāhui
E lawe aku i nā lawehala ma kāhi 'ē
E maliu i ku'u uwalo e
Ho'iho'i mai iā mākou i ka 'āina
Ho'iho'i mai iā mākou i ke aupuni e
E mālama, e ho'oulu i ko 'oukou mau pulapula
A kolopupū, a haumaka 'iole
A ka'ikōkō, a pala lauhala e
E pale i nā mea 'ino a pau e
Amama, ua noa, ua lele wale aku no e ----.

Aloha nui e ku'u lāhui Hawai'i e. 'Auhea 'oukou, e nā kini o Keawe, e nā pua o Pi'ilani, e nā koko o Kākuhihewa, a me nā mu'o o Manōkalanipō. E nā po'e 'ōiwi mai ka pi'ina a ka lā i Ha'eha'e ā hiki i ka nāpo'o 'ana o ka lā i Ka'ula. Aloha! Aloha nō ho'i e nā Haole lokomaika'i. Aloha paha e nā Haole i koe.

'O wau nō 'o Lilikalā Kapueomaluo Kaupō Kame'eleihiwa. He keiki 'eu nō ho'i wau mai ka ua lani ha'aha'a o Hāna, mokupuni o Māui, mai ka pūhaka a Pi'ilani a me Kekaulike wahine. Ke noho nei au ma ka lalo o nā pali Ko'olau ma Kāne'ohe, kaulana i ke ki'eki'e, a ke a'o nei wau ma kēia Kulanui o Hawai'i ma ka Hālau 'Ike o Hawai'i.

Mahalo nui iā 'oukou a pau loa no ko 'oukou hele 'ana mai i kēia ahiahi e ho'olohe i nā polopeka no'eau paha e pili ana i ke kumuhana kaumaha nō ho'i ma mua o kakou nei, 'o ia ho'i ka ho'oilina o Colonialism. Pehea, he aha kēlā mea? I ku'u mana'o, 'o ka hua'ōlelo pololei no kēlā, 'o Colonialism, 'o ka 'Aihue Aupuni me ka 'Aihue 'Āina, a i 'ole 'o ke Kā'ili Ea paha. No laila 'o ko kākou kumuhana i kēia ahiahi *'O ka Ho'oilina o ka 'Aihue Aupuni a me ka 'Ai'ē o ke Kulanui.*

'Ike maoli nō ka lāhui Hawai'i i ka hopena o ka 'Aihue 'Āina o ke Aupuni a me ke Kā'ili Ea ma kēia one hānau o Hawai'i. 'O mākou me ko mākou mau kūpuna e noho nei me ka hō'eha 'ana a ka po'e Haole iā mākou. He aha kēia 'eha? 'O ka 'ilihune nō ho'i o ka lāhui maoli. Ke noho nei ka lāhui ma kahakai, ma loko o nā ka'a kahiko, ma ke kauna, ma loko o nā hale popopo, ma loko o ka lepo o ke alanui kekahi, a i 'ole noho 'elua, 'ekolu, 'ehā mau 'ohana ma loko o ka hale ho'okahi. A pa'akikī nō ho'i ka noho 'ana ma Hawai'i nei i kēia mau lā, he noho 'ilihune wale nō no ka lāhui maoli o kēia pae 'āina.

Eia kekahi hopena 'eha 'ē a'e o ka 'Aihue Aupuni, 'o ka hilahila o ka lāhui maoli i ko mākou inoa, i ko mākou 'ili, i ko mākou lauoho, me ka lehelehe, me ka ihu me ke kino ho'i! Nānā mākou i ke aniani kilohi a hilahila mākou, mamuli o ka ho'okae 'ana a ka po'e haole iā mākou no nā makahiki 'elua haneli a 'oi aku.

Akā na'e, eia ka hewa 'eha loa o ka po'e haole iā mākou. Ua pāpā 'ia ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i e ka po'e Haole 'Aihue Aupuni, no laila ua pāpā 'ia ko ka lāhui Hawai'i leo e 'ōlelo, e 'uwē, e ku'ē i nā hewa hō'eha iā mākou. Ua pepehi 'ia ko mākou mau mākua, ko mākou

mau kūpuna, ma ke kula no ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i 'ana ā hilahila nō ho'i lākou. Ua pepehi a pepehi a pepehi a hiki i ka manawa i maka'u loa ai ko mākou mau mākua. A hiki i kēia mau lā, maka'u loa mākou i ka 'ōlelo, ma ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i a ma ka 'ōlelo haole kekahi! Maka'u loa mākou i ka nā'au o puana ana i kekahi hewa, a noho mākou i ka weliweli ma nā wahi pō'ele, e hūnā 'ia ka mana'o o ka pu'uwai. Ua lilo mākou i lāhui mū.

A i kēia manawa 'ānō, ua hō'ea mai kekahi wahine Hawai'i wiwo'ole, e puana ana i ko mākou mana'o hūnā. 'O Haunani-Kay Kawēkiuohaleakalā Trask kona inoa. 'Ōlelo 'o ia, "E ka po'e haole, mai hō'eha i ku'u lāhui, mai ho'okaumaha iā mākou me ko 'oukou mau wahahe'e. Ua hewa kā ho'i ka 'Aihue Aupuni. Pono 'oukou, e nā kolea, e hō'ihi i ka lāhui Hawai'i a me ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i. Pono 'oukou e lilo i haumāna a a'o mai i ka mo'olelo o nā hewa a ka po'e Haole i ka lāhui Hawai'i o kēia pae'āina, a i 'ole inā 'a'ole 'oukou makemake e hō'ihi mai, hiki iā 'oukou ke ha'alele, ma ka mokulele, me ka 'āwīwī!" A ho'oweli kēia wahine Hawai'i pōkole i ka po'e Haole loko 'ino a pau!

And now my friends we can speak in Hawaiian, and we can speak in English, and because of the fearless nature of this one short Hawaiian woman, Haunani-Kay Trask, we can speak on any and all of the oppression that we suffer in our daily lives. Haunani's greatest virtue is that she speaks the truth, and she speaks it everywhere. She terrifies racist Haoles, and now we, the Native people are free to let our hidden thoughts be heard. Because of her bravery, *Pacific Islands Monthly* has chosen her as one of the thirteen Pacific women of 1991. She has given us our voices back and we will forevermore resist the Haole attempt to silence us.

For those of you in the audience who did not understand my explanation in Hawaiian of the legacy of colonialism, and who perhaps felt afraid or uncomfortable, as this crazy Hawaiian woman seemed to go on interminably in a foreign tongue, you now have experienced for five minutes what my people have suffered for the past one hundred years. Surely one legacy of American colonialism in Hawai'i has been the banning of Hawaiian language and the subsequent beating of my parent's and grandparent's generation for speaking Hawaiian at school. They were beaten into silence and submission.

The repression of the Hawaiian language is but one of the legacies of American colonialism in Hawai'i; the others include

incredible poverty for the Native people through dispossession of our lands. Our people live in caves, we live at beach parks, in old cars, in slums, and on the streets. Many of us live with two, three, or even four families in one house. I myself was a child of the slums. I am the only one in my family to have graduated from high school, although in the 1880s my Hawaiian great-grandfather was a lawyer. Poverty and destitution is a legacy of colonialism.

Another legacy of colonialism is the seed of self-doubt and self-hatred that was planted in our hearts. The seed was planted by Haole racists who degraded and disrespected everything Hawaiian, including our culture, our physical appearance, our manner of dress, our religious beliefs, our genealogies, our bones, our chanting, our political opinions, and even our names. Nor did this degradation end in the past, it flourishes today. I would be willing to bet that 90 percent of this audience, most of whom have lived in Hawai'i for years, and most of whom are of the University community, cannot even pronounce my name.

Certainly the President of the University, Al Simone, cannot and he thinks it a laughing matter. He has mangled my name publicly on a number of occasions, including at an international conference of University Presidents. Once more a Native Hawaiian must face public ridicule in her Native land.

If we think of colonialism and its legacy as a wrong that must be righted, then without doubt it is the University, that institution which in Western tradition leads the enlightenment of society, that should address the wrongs of its colonial legacy and begin to heal the wounds caused by those wrongs. There can be no peace until there is justice.

However, many of you from America living in Hawai'i may not believe that colonialism is so terrible. I have been told countless times that Hawaiians are lucky to have been conquered by America. Or you may believe as we were told last week that colonialism, like racism, is a fantasy, despite our very real pain. Many more of you may not think of Hawai'i as an American colony, and merely ignore the overwhelming American military presence here, so let us digress to a definition of terms.

Since there are many opinions on the definition of colonialism, let me define it from a Native point of view. To me colonialism is when one country, almost always of another race and usually one of the savage white tribes of Europe, or America, conquers another country, usually one of people of color, and imposes its system of government, language, and cultural institutions on the other.

Colonialism does not describe the conflict of opposing, even warring factions, within the same culture and race, as that is more properly called a civil war, and no matter how bloody, the latter is considerably less vicious than the former. A civil war is a matter of political disagreement, and when it is over, people may be dissatisfied or even imprisoned, but their world does not disappear. They continue to speak their language and practice their customs, despite their political differences.

In a colonial situation, the conquered are faced with an entirely strange and fearful world order. Every aspect of this world changes, and the defeated must submit, or face certain dire retribution. It is not only a physically violent situation, it is always a psychologically devastating event. When the Native language is forbidden, the subjugated Native may not find comfort, or even cry out her distress, in the cultural terms which are familiar.

Consider for a moment if Japan had won the war and all of you red-blooded Americans were forced to forever abjure English and only speak and read Japanese. How assertive and confident would you be then? The colonized Native must learn an entirely new and foreign language before Native resistance can be verbalized to the colonizers.

And, the colonial power must justify its oppression in the eyes of the world, whether with excuses of white cultural superiority, imposition of democratic ideals, or righteous retribution for unauthorized aggression. In reality, such ideals only serve as a mask to hide deep-seated beliefs of racial superiority, which is the true face of colonialism. In the case of the American takeover of Hawai'i, Haole imperialists insisted that Haole should not be ruled by any people of color, no matter what their lineage and training, and that it did not really matter what the Native people thought, as they were too ignorant for self government. Hawaiians were not allowed to vote on Hawai'i becoming an American territory.

I have had countless Haole say to me, if Hawaiians really objected to American imperialism, why did Hawaiians not rise up and kill the white aggressors? They then proceed to tell me that my people had a secret desire to be taken over by America and that Hawaiians were jubilant about it. That lie is still being taught today by the white racists of the ROTC department at Kamehameha schools. In the words of the military jargon so beloved by America, 'let me establish the scenario' for you.

When Jesus Christ was being born in Bethlehem, my ancestors, the Hawaiian people, had already established themselves

in the beautiful land of Hawai'i nei. We cultivated the land and sea, and we prospered. We saw ourselves as the descendants of the Gods, Papa and Wākea, and we celebrated life and their divine blessings in these lovely islands. Perhaps it was not a perfect society, as none ever is, but it was well organized. Our ancestors worked an average of four hours a day, devoting the remainder of their time to leisure, to surfing, to hula and to love making--the civilized arts. In this setting, our nation grew to a million people by 1778.

Enter upon that scene Captain Cook and his men, bringing venereal disease and tuberculosis. Like many other Native peoples, we had no immunities to foreign diseases and we were devastated. Waves of foreigners and waves of foreign epidemics crashed upon our shores. The bubonic plague came in 1804, followed by:

influenza in 1826
whooping cough in 1832
mumps in 1839
leprosy in 1840
measles, whooping cough, and influenza in 1848
smallpox in 1853
whooping cough in 1888
diptheria in 1890
cholera in 1895
bubonic plague (again) in 1899

When the first missionary census was taken in 1824, only 134,000 Hawaiians remained, reflecting a population decline of 90 percent in the first 45 years of contact with the Haole. By 1893 when Haole overthrew our government, only 40,000 Hawaiians remained. If we had had a million Hawaiians in 1893, we would still have our country. Haole diseases are an ally of Haole colonialism.

Foreign epidemics were not our greatest problem. Far more dangerous were the foreigners who came to stay--Haole capitalists who wanted our sandalwood and our land, and Haole missionaries who wanted our souls. These were the forerunners of economic and religious colonialism. The missionaries told us they loved us and would protect us from their rapacious countrymen, if we would but trust them. Haole missionaries also told us that we were dying because we were ignorant heathens, and that if we would only change our religion, our laws, and our system of land tenure to

private ownership of land that we would be saved! This is the Calvinist version of the capitalist heaven.

What was the Hawaiian response? Some Hawaiians said, let us make love to the Haole and then they will love us. Other Hawaiians disagreed. In 1819 Kekuaokalani, a great Ali'i Nui, suggested that Hawaiians should kill all Haole in Hawai'i and forever ban them from our shores. Other Ali'i Nui objected, arguing that we should proceed with cautious aloha. Our leaders wanted peace because too many of our people were dying from the terrible diseases. We must live with the Haole somehow. The question they asked was, *"Pehea lā e pono ai"?* How shall we live in harmony? It is a question we still ask today.

So our Ali'i Nui followed the advice of our alleged friends, the Haole missionaries from America. In 1824, our leaders led the nation into Christianity. In 1839, they adopted a bill of rights and in 1840 a constitution based on the American model. In 1848, after our alleged friends had argued for years that *only* capitalism and private ownership of land would save us from Haole imperialism and the extinction of our race, the Ali'i Nui finally agreed to the Māhele.

Imagine our surprise when in 1893, the children of these same Haole missionaries brought in American marines to help overthrow the Hawaiian government and ban the Hawaiian language! Even then, our Queen refused to massacre those duplicitous Haole, as some Hawaiians urged, rejecting such killing as uncivilized. She would wait, she said, for the justice of America to undo the great wrongs that Americans had done to us. We are still waiting. So much for cautious aloha!

Now we Hawaiians say, that when it comes to the Haole, we will proceed with caution, never mind the aloha. If the Haole who run this University want our aloha, then they must learn to treat us with respect. They must learn to behave as guests in our ancestral homeland, and support the Native people in all ways. We are weary of justifying ourselves as Natives, day after day, to the Haole world. We want your unconditional support. We do not seek to kill you or even to drive you all from our shores. But we insist that you put aside your racism. After all my friends, aloha is at least a two-way street.

The duty of this University is to recognize the debt owed to the Native people, and to repair the harm that has been done to us. And we don't want lip service, we want action. We want this University to build a complex to house Hawaiian Studies and Operation

Kua'ana, our student services program, so that we may educate our people. In that complex we want a Hawaiian TV and radio station, as well as a Hawaiian Language preschool. This University must cease its objections to the merger of Hawaiian Studies and Hawaiian Language at the Mānoa campus. We want tuition waivers for all Hawaiians who wish to study at the University systemwide, undergraduate and graduate. We want housing for Hawaiian students and professors.

The University should require all administrators, professors, and students to take our introductory course, Hawaiian Studies 107, so that they may understand the Hawaiian point of view and learn of where they live, in Polynesia. All University administrators, professors, and students should be required to take Hawaiian Language 101, so they can learn to spell and pronounce our names correctly. We insist that all University of Hawai'i letterhead and signage spell the words Mānoa and Hawai'i correctly.

The University must provide position counts for the expansion of the Center for Hawaiian Studies, in order that we may teach these classes to Natives as well as the foreigners who live in our land. We insist upon the adoption of an affirmative action plan for the hiring of Hawaiians and we want to help formulate that plan. We want qualified Hawaiians hired in tenure track positions and we want them tenured. Towards that end, each department in the University should foster the training of at least one Hawaiian who will become a tenured professor in that department.

Last but not least, this University Administration must cease its vindictive racist campaign against our sister, Dr. Haunani-Kay Trask, a brilliant Hawaiian woman who speaks fearlessly on our behalf. Hawaiians believe that Haole racism against Native Hawaiians and against people of color can be overcome by education. We challenge the Haole who run this University to devote themselves to that education. Mahalo.

A Journey into the Mind and Body of a Colonial Institution

FARIDEH FARHI

I HAVE entitled this talk "A Journey into the Mind and Body of a Colonial Institution," in order to make two general comments. First that I will not talk about the legacy of colonialism at the university because I firmly believe that I currently operate within a colonial institution and, second, that I intend to be very specific about the exact practices (intellectual and institutional) that characterize this university. In doing so, I speak from a very specific location: that of an outsider. Not being acknowledged as an Asian by the dominant ideology (after all, the Middle East is somewhere in a very dark cloud) and not being connected to any of the minority communities in Hawai'i clearly give me a different vantage point. But I also have another voice, that of a tenured faculty, which is generated out of my position as an insider (albeit a very marginal one). And it is the intellectual, teaching, and institutional practices of the faculty that I would like to emphasize here. As some of you may know, it is with great sadness that I decide not to attack President Simone and the administration, something I truly enjoy and have done repeatedly in the past years. But this university is the preeminent institution of higher learning in the state and, as such, it is the place in which much of the ideological framework for existing social relationships in Hawai'i is worked out and ultimately, I will argue, it is the most important vehicle for legitimizing the intellectual dominance of the Euro-American tradition. And here it is the faculty that must be held at least as accountable as the administration, if not more so.

Clearly the easiest place to begin is the general makeup of the university's population. The faculty and powerful administrators are overwhelmingly white, the secretaries and custodial workers are

local. I am not mentioning the students at this point not because they are insignificant but because I think it is important to lay out the organization of work on this campus and who benefits from it. Immense amounts of thought and money are spent on bringing a mostly white faculty from the continent, while most of the secretaries have to have a second job in order to survive. Since I have been here, I have heard very few faculty lamenting the low pay for the secretaries, but I have sure heard a lot of complaining about the faculty's low pay. What is astonishing about this condition is not that it exists and that the labor process on this campus is divided along such rigid colonial lines (local workers and nonlocal faculty) but that it is accepted as so natural. I remember very vividly sitting in an Arts and Sciences Faculty Executive Committee meeting where for more than half an hour the white faculty complained about the inefficient custodial staff and their inability to keep the work environment clean for the faculty. Furthermore, they were livid at these workers' union for preventing "us" from getting "our" due service from them. This conversation amazingly happened in the midst of the heated faculty union negotiation over higher pay. When a Korean-American colleague, a woman faculty and I meekly pointed out that this conversation was a bit obscene, shattered looks followed that implied: "You are not accusing us of racism, are you?"

No, I wasn't accusing "us" of racism. I was accusing "us" of something more fundamental: of participating in the establishment and perpetuation of an institution in which a few people end up having houses in Mānoa or Makiki Heights and others serve to make that possible. Of course, this happens in all universities and in many places racism is an important part of this dichotomy, but at the University of Hawai'i it clearly takes on a colonial tinge. The bosses are from the continent, the workers are local. The dichotomy is not between white and black or white and chicano; it is between nonlocal and local. Now I know many of you object to my crass economism. I hear you because you are always very loud. "Things are a lot more complicated here," you say. "We have the highest number of minority faculty in comparison to other universities. . . . The Japanese control the education system in Hawai'i." No matter what you say though, the facts remain that the faculty is overwhelmingly white, the large number of minority faculty mentioned are nonlocal like me, and (there is always the and) the secretaries and custodial workers are local.

You say, so what? "We are here to educate and where we come from and the color of our skin do not prevent us from doing this value-free enterprise called education properly." You say, "our only responsibility is to be good teachers and pass along our knowledge." Aside from the fact that many of us are lousy teachers, I say that the missionaries claimed the same thing. The only difference is that they preached and administered Christianity in the name of a universal good, while the faculty in this university teaches and administers the superiority of North American values and practices in the name of universal knowledge. You might say that in this comparison one can only be favorably impressed by the missionaries' honesty. Let me give you some concrete examples,

Counting through the English department's offerings mentioned in the University's General Information Bulletin, there is an incredible array of courses on anything that's British. You name it: Chaucer, 16th, early 17th, Restoration and early 18th, later 18th century, Victorian, and on and on. And if you think that our teachers of English do not like the English that comes out of colonies, you are wrong. Students can enroll in American Literature to 1865, from 1865 to the present, the American Novel to 1900, the 20th Century American Novel, Studies in American Literature, and on and on. Of course, my point is not that these things should not be taught. But what is the purpose of complete dismissal of all the linguistic and stylistic innovations generated, for instance, out of the very rich African and Caribbean literature written in English. Certainly the reason could not be that the English department, being an English department after all, is remaining true to its foundation generated out of the good old empire. The inclusion of "American" literature belies this contention. The more plausible explanation, it seems to me, is that the English department does not think that contributions to the English language that have been made by anybody who is not British or North American is worth acknowledging. Now, I admit that the department offers a one-year sequence on world literature (whatever that means) and I know that there are some faculty members that teach various Third World writers who express themselves in English. But there is a fundamental difference between the introduction of these folks as English writers by one or two faculty, and the systematic examination of English as it colonizes and is appropriated by the colonized. Clearly the latter requires a departmental acknowledgement of the diversity of English as a language that has had an incredibly busy travel itinerary. The obligatory nod to world

literature, it seems to me, is yet another example of appropriating the exotic as a way to "jazz up" the English show as opposed to examining in genuine ways precisely how the English language as the masters' tool has intermingled with local languages and hence been transformed, through very ingenious appropriation, by those refusing to play dead to its colonizing practices.

An argument can be made here that this practice is not unique to Hawai'i and happens in every other U.S. university. My point, of course, is that the University of Hawai'i should not behave like every other U.S. university and the fact that it does clearly represents its colonial disposition. My god, we live in a place where a vibrant language like pidgin surrounds us and the official university policy is to name it bad English and to forbid it for all practical purposes. Now, I am not advocating that pidgin should become part of the English department's curriculum. In all likelihood, that would sap the vitality of this resistive language. What I am saying is that the practice of constructing the British and "American" way of speaking English as the only proper way is a colonizing practice intended to intimidate, silence, and ultimately create a social hierarchy based on how well you speak that language in the Anglo-American way.

Now, if you think that I am being unfair by only picking on the English department, I do have other examples, which I will mention only briefly. For instance, just imagine the arrogance it takes to have a department called American Studies without ever even hinting that America is not only the United States? I must acknowledge that the American Studies department has many courses on minorities in the United States, but can this be a justification for erasing Central and South Americas from their students' as well as the faculty's intellectual map? And then there is SHAPS and the constituent and connected body of faculty from various departments, extending from the "beloved" philosophy department to political science to natural sciences. This magnificent bastion of area studies, where a mostly Euro-American faculty (the exception of Hawaiian studies is loudly noted) studies other people's habits, values, politics, and so on, makes us a "unique" university, it is said. But the bottom line is colonialism. Habits are deconstructed, people from all over are objectified, their psyches overanalyzed, but none of these analyzed "things" ever make a dent into the mind of the examiners. As Edward Said, the Palestinian writer and literary critic, says, the analyzers mostly never listen to what the people they study say, as they analyze them and their

practices. Hence, the people of Asia and the Pacific merely become cases to prove or disprove theoretical models already fully developed within the walls of Western academia. Careers are made and competing notions of the Third World are constructed, without the presence of examined practices.

What does all this mean for our students? I would argue, a pretty dismal learning experience. What makes this university different, of course, is that the student body itself mostly belongs to the overanalyzed groups. Remember, Hawaiians are lazy, the Japanese are diligent, Filipinos are unsophisticated, and so on. Of course we are becoming a bit more sophisticated. No more outright stereotypes, at least in mixed company. But we cannot shed our colonial demeanor. Let us think about that oft repeated warning every new faculty member receives from colleagues about local students not speaking in the classroom. Much time is spent analyzing the phenomena, the Center for Teaching Excellence even kills many trees pondering the issue and, as a political science student, Cindy Kobayashi, recently pointed out, some more liberal faculty members even take credit for helping these poor souls to come out of their shells and speak in the classroom (as though inequalities in this university will suddenly vanish when the students speak in the classroom). The concern is having the students come out of their shells but, never never, as this very bright student wrote, is there any attempt to understand what "their" shells are about. The faculty hardly ever listen any way. Why should the students tell their stories in the classroom? For all we know it could be that we are deadly boring in the classroom. It may be that what we say, and the way we say it, may at least partially connect to the experiences of some on the continent but not here. Here, I must acknowledge that self-criticism has not been one of the colonizers' strengths.

Although I have painted a pretty dismal picture about the workings of this university, I do not want to end here because I think it is very important not to talk about this university as a monolithic entity. As we have come to see very blatantly in the past few years and especially in the past few months, there is resistance (Hawaiian Studies is a good example but there are also pockets of resistance in other departments and programs, including English, American Studies, and SHAPS). I am convinced that it is because of these resistive pockets that this university becomes a contested terrain in the ideal academic sense. Debates are generated, the university is forced to change its practices not because of the

colonizers' magnanimity but because of concerted, untiring resistance coming mostly from students but also from some faculty. But let us not forget the dominant faculty's ability for counterattack.

As Haunani-Kay Trask's case has shown, some of our faculty know no limits. They are ready to contradict themselves, coopt the issue of student rights to attack one of the very few Hawaiian faculty, and even willingly offer to abdicate some of their own academic rights (as it was discussed in the Faculty Senate) in order to silence Haunani and by implication other faculty who oppose the system. Here, I would like to remind you that colonialism has always preferred order over individual rights. Hence, under various administrative colonialisms, martial law and curfews were very much the preferred mode of operation despite inconveniences for the colonizers as well. After all, the colonizers knew that curfews can always be curbed for them. Fortunately, attempts to curb individual rights have not worked so far in terms of an actual reprimand being handed out by our "beloved" president. But we now know a lot more about the viciousness of the system and it is important that we learn from the intellectual tactics used not only to discredit Haunani-Kay Trask, but also the Hawaiian cause. Furthermore, it is important to understand these intellectual tactics as yet another manifestation of colonialism.

What were the nature of the attacks on Haunani-Kay Trask? Interestingly enough, however true to the North American obsession with procedures, the first and foremost attacks were not at all substantive: "We acknowledge Haunani's right to talk about her politics as long as she is not abusive to students." These sudden champions of student rights apparently did not have any problems with Haunani's argument but only her style! Hence, with a sweeping stroke, they not only accused Haunani of student abuse, but also insulted her supporters' intelligence. They wanted us to believe that what Haunani says does not bother them; it is merely the way she says it. Now this is a very well-known colonial technique, always wondering about the ethics of the opposition's tactics. Their own tactics are considered to be ethical and the evidence is that they are practicing it and hence it must be ethical because they are practicing it. As a side comment, this is the same process that ends up calling the Iraqi scud attack on the U.S. military quarters that led to the death of twenty-eight American soldiers as a terrorist act and the flying of close to one hundred thousand Allied sorties over Iraq as "Just War."

Now when it was pointed out that this university is failing in its promise of engaging in dialogues on controversial issues, things became a bit nasty. "Who is Haunani Trask anyway? Doesn't she have some non-Hawaiian blood? Isn't she part-*haole* herself? What right does she have to speak against *haole*?" I mention these comments (which did not come out of gossip columns but took pages and pages of our "free" dailies) not because they are funny, but to point out the more intellectually sophisticated argument that underlies all this: "How could Haunani attack U.S. imperialism when it is the North American academic context that has given her the tools to speak her mind? She couldn't speak this way in old Hawai'i!" Well, as far as I know, Haunani-Kay Trask doesn't live in old Hawai'i and old Hawai'i wasn't colonized. But think about this incredible colonial maneuver. If you are Hawaiian, local, or any non-Euro-American, you are either branded as stupid because you do not speak, or if you speak and say what they don't like to hear, you are delegitimized because you are using the masters' tools anyway. Only if you speak and say what they like to hear are you considered intellectually consistent, correct, and nice.

There is also another more sophisticated, but I think more sinister, intellectual maneuver at work. Those making it usually introduce themselves as the more liberal folks, and also avoid the larger issue of Hawaiian sovereignty or the denigration of the local. They are, of course, publicly disdainful of the philosophy department's attack on Haunani-Kay Trask, but they chastise the philosophy department for its stupidity. They prefer not talking about the issue at all. What the philosophy department did was simply to cause unnecessary agitation. Sitting very comfortably in their offices, these faculty members become area specialists on the University of Hawai'i. They analyze, overanalyze, deconstruct, find very interesting processes at work, but ultimately worry about the increasingly tense racial environment on campus and the effects that will have on "free expression" of their ideas, or more concretely on congenial relationships that exist among the faculty. But what do they think about the sovereignty issue? For that matter, what do they think about the United States bombing another country into oblivion? The answers to these questions are quite complicated and come after long pauses intended to give assurances that a critical mind is at work here. Are you wondering what the answers are? Well, I am too. What I hear over and over again is the same line but no answers; that reality is very complex and multilayered and there are different interpretations. Struggling to get out of this ocean of

interpretation, I take a breath and ask the same question: are you for Hawaiian sovereignty or not? At this point, I am bombarded with that age-old academic/colonial tactic: incomprehensible and totally meaningless tapestries of words and sentences intended to tell me that I have a very "uncritical and uninteresting" mind (of course, these are their words--the clear way of putting it is that I am stupid). As an afterthought I am referred to this or that great author (usually French) that has written extensively about the urge, or more properly, the will to look for easy answers. In one easy move (for them of course) I am psychologized and my attitude problematized. I am told that I am morally righteous and this makes it difficult for them to have a dialogue with me. By the way, this may be one of the side effects of inhabiting a colonial institution. I have never been in any place where the term morally righteous is so easily thrown at politically active people and is clearly intended to be an insult (I wonder what is the proper way of being: morally unrighteous?). In any case, after all this I, of course, am still wondering are they for the war or against the war, for sovereignty or against. . .

I also often wonder what would happen if some of these well-respected intellectual giants would take a public stance for Hawaiian rights or even a better treatment of the local population within the university (and as mentioned above, there are very few who have). I usually end up not dwelling on the issue for too long. Resistance to colonial practices must and does come from Hawaiian and local students and faculty. If the past two years are any measure, things will be harder for the largely *haole* faculty in this university as their teaching techniques and intellectual practices become challenged in public forums as well as within the classrooms. Unfortunately, as the actions of the philosophy department and its supporters in the Faculty Senate and Bachman Hall have shown, some will rely on any possible technique from outright force to intellectual manipulation to fight back. I hope that this will be a losing battle for them and I thank god that there are some people who do politics in order to make it a losing battle for them.

To Challenge Colonial Structures and Preserve the Integrity of Place: The Unique Potential Role of the University

NOEL JACOB KENT

COLONIALISM IS alive and well and living in Hawai'i today. The evidence is everywhere around us. We see it in the suppression of the Hawaiian and Hawaiian Creole languages in the public school system; the general economic and social condition of the Hawaiian people; and the desecration of sacred Hawaiian relics. We see it in the twenty large resort complexes planned for completion before the end of the century, which will consolidate the stranglehold of international tourism corporations over the island economy. We see it in the low-wage high-cost economic structure and the way in which local youths--especially from certain ethnic groups--are slotted into menial, dead-end jobs. We see it in the transformation of Lāna'i from an agricultural to a tourism base. (On Lāna'i now a visitor spending $900 per night can lounge around his hotel room and be waited on hand and foot by local waitresses and butlers, all dressed to the nines). *This is the kind of society we are building in Hawai'i--grossly inequitable, highly polarized by class and ethnicity, and increasingly vulnerable to the most narrow kind of nationalist appeals.*

The critical question thus becomes how to undermine and ultimately replace the contemporary model of development and the colonial relationships that are at its core. That this year marks the fifteenth anniversary of the triumph of a people's movement at Waiāhole-Waikāne valleys in Windward, O'ahu, is relevant here. The farmers in Waiāhole-Waikāne fought successfully against great odds to retain their lands and lifestyle. They defied nothing less than a powerful development coalition, the Windward Partners, abetted by the political power of the governor's and mayor's offices.

Afforded outside support and resources by the University of Hawai'i Ethnic Studies Program, they were able to resist evictions and are still situated in the valleys, growing their papaya, taro, and sweet potatoes.

The lesson of the Waiāhole-Waikāne struggle was one which the International Longshoreman's and Warehouseman's Union and other trade union organizers had learned in the 1930s and 1940s in Hawai'i: the power for change generated by a multiethnic movement organized at the grass-roots level is formidable indeed. Ultimately, given the nature of Hawai'i's demographics, only multiethnic coalitions can be effective agents of change. To let the dominant political and economic elites (or opportunistic nationalist or political leaders) divide us along ethnic lines is to preclude the possibilities of a genuine challenge to contemporary colonial structures. And we recognize that only a major restructuring of the manner in which political and economic institutions operate can yield social justice for Native Hawaiians and others.

The Role of the University

The University of Hawai'i has the opportunity to play a variety of roles in the process of undermining colonialism and bringing forth the vision of a transformed society. First, we who are faculty can provide students with a critical education that challenges the dominant (hegemonic) ideas of our time. We can provide a variety of alternative perspectives and formulations that become alternative visions of the future. Moreover, as *public men and women* deeply engaged in a variety of public arenas, we provide enduring models for students and colleagues of intellectual commitments that transcend conventional notions of the academics' responsibility to society.

To undermine colonialism means to revitalize the diverse meanings and strengths of "localism." Here, the university has a profound role to play. But the foundation stone for this role is refocusing the university mission upon helping to defend the cultural integrity and lifestyles of Hawai'i's communities. This means involving ourselves in the life of these communities and providing resources and skills that support them in sifting through the options that define their present and future course. This is not easy to achieve on any campus: "localism" is all too easily equated with parochialism in this metropolitan age. Furthermore, academic interest in, and therefore *legitimation of*, local values and lifestyles

surely runs counter to the perpetuation of dominant ideologies and values, one of the prime agendas of higher education in Hawai'i. It is instructive to remember that during the mid-1970s, when the Ethnic Studies Program interpreted its mission as being actively engaged in the study and support of threatened communities such as Waiāhole-Waikāne and He'eia Kea, the response of the Mānoa administration was to attempt to destroy the program.

Yet, it remains perfectly feasible to build a local community orientation *within* significant areas of the university, if not to reorient the entire university mission to localism. Until now, the university (and especially the Mānoa campus) has been regarded as more or less irrelevant to the needs and problems of large numbers of local citizens. A proactive role by university people dedicated to sustaining and enhancing local communities would generate widespread new interest and a constituency large enough to override the inevitable backlash from entrenched interests inside and outside the university. The survival and growth of the Ethnic Studies Program, in the face of opposition from university administrators over the years, makes this point clear.

The rewards for the university in utilizing Hawai'i as a great "social laboratory" would be profound. The encounter would occur in that most exciting and dynamic field of contemporary higher education: the experiential. Critics of today's colleges and universities excoriate the degree to which the education they offer is marred by fragmentation and overspecialization, and demand an innovative education process that helps students toward intellectual flexibility, lifelong learning skills, and the ability to "negotiate their environment" (Musil 1990). "Service learning" in particular has acquired a new cachet among higher education innovators for its power as an individually "transforming event" enabling the young student to "become an active citizen in a larger society" (Knefelkamp 1990). By the late 1980s a series of generalized service learning programs began to generate great academic interest throughout campuses in the United States. The failures of conventional higher education to provide a genuine learning praxis have given experiential modes of education new credibility (Rubin 1990).

The Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Hawai'i engaged in a remarkable experiment in affective-experiential learning during the middle 1970s. From the first, it drew its raison d'être and strength from its grass-roots "localistic" orientation (and the identification of much of Hawaii's population with "local," in the

face of overwhelming modernization) (Yamamoto 1990). A new discipline in the making, Ethnic Studies stressed group and collaborative learning and involved hundreds of students in projects intimately bound up with community needs. Lab leaders assumed a wide range of roles as project coordinators, community organizers, and liaisons between the communities and students. In retrospect, while the inevitable mistakes of immaturity and inexperience were made, the involvement of students in community situations had lasting benefits for both parties. The communities gained critical support and resources at an optimum time. The continuing existence of Waiāhole-Waikāne, the River Street Chinatown community, and the Young Street community, among others, are testaments to the effectiveness of the Ethnic Studies projects. Students, in turn, learned a range of interpersonal and planning skills that became invaluable in their careers; the skills they learned were definitely transferable to their adult careers. As actively involved "public people," many remained committed to the public arena as trade union leaders, legislators, professionals, and so on. Thus they were able to affirm and maintain a lifelong commitment to the responsibilities of citizenship in the larger society. Although the Ethnic Studies Program (under a variety of pressures) largely replaced its affective learning orientation with a cognitive one in the 1980s, it is now engaged in trying to move its educational compass toward an affective-cognitive balance. The program faculty continue to regard the success of its earlier projects in promoting personal empowerment, problem-solving skills, and public commitments as a harbinger of future educational modes in Hawai'i.

Conclusion

Given the subordinate economic and cultural relationship of the Hawaiian islands to the United States mainland, we can properly think of Hawai'i as a colonial variant. Nowadays, the tyranny of the dollar, of international capital, of development run amok prevail. The University of Hawai'i contains a critical mass of talent, resources, knowledge, and skills that can be used on behalf of a transformative vision of society. Historically, however, these have been used on behalf of sustaining the hegemony of the system; the "communities" identified by the university as legitimate clients are almost exclusively business, tourism, and the military. Given the structure of hierarchy and power in the university and the loyalties of its top bureaucrats to the status quo, it is unlikely that the

"official" university can be moved to undertake any dramatic reorientation. This drive will, of essence, come from below. The continuing movement of students, faculty, and departments toward the situation of *being responsible to Hawai'i and to a wide cross section of citizens* can be a profound step toward creating an environment where the university mission becomes intimately linked to the welfare of the society and its grass-roots communities. Then, the state university will be truly deserving of its name: the University *of* Hawai'i.

REFERENCES

Ethnic Studies Program Academic Review. 1973, 1974, 1975, 1977.

Musil, Caryn McTighe. 1990. "In Search of a Metaphor for the Major: A Feminist Challenge." *Liberal Education* 76, no. 5 (September-October): 18-21.

Knefelkamp, Lee. 1990. "Seasons of Academic Life: Honoring Our Collective Autobiography." *Liberal Education* 76, no. 3 (May-June): 4--11.

Rubin, Sharon G. 1990. "Service for Living: Education for Democracy." *Liberal Education* 76, no. 3 (May-June): 12-17.

Yamamoto, Eric. 1979. "The Significance of Local." *Social Process in Hawai'i* 27: 12-19.

Colonialism at the University of Hawai'i: The Experience of a Pacific Island Student

DAVID WELCHMAN GEGEO

GENEALOGY IS important to us in the Pacific islands. At the first forum, Haunani-Kay Trask gave her genealogy. Here is mine.

I am David Welchman Gegeo of the Kwara'ae people of Mala'ita Island in the Solomon Islands. My mother Doreen Tangoia was of the Ferasubua clan of Lau. My father David Buamae is head of the land that belongs to our sub-clan, Ragito, which is the chiefly line of the Kuarafi clan, the largest and most important clan in Kwara'ae. My ancestors were the chiefs, priests, and war leaders of the past.

The Ragito Kuarafi were among the leaders of Maasina Rule, the political movement that resisted the British in the Solomons, and struggled to bring colonialism to an end after World War II. Mala'ita island was the first island in the Solomons to replace British rule with an island council. And the first President of Mala'ita Council was a Ragito Kuarafi elder of my descent line. After independence, the first Member of Parliament from my constituency was also a Ragito Kuarafi man of my descent line.

When I was born, the Solomon Islands had been a British colony--they euphemistically called it a "protectorate"--for almost a hundred years. Colonialism and racism seemed to be part of the air we breathed. My father lost his position in the medical service for openly challenging the racism of his white superiors. I was caned in school for questioning Christian doctrine, for speaking my own language in defiance of school rules, and for attempting to engage my British teachers in intellectual debate.

Colonialism has several characteristics. The first characteristic is political domination of one nation over another, such that control

and decisions are imposed from outside. That was the case with the British in the Solomons, and with the Americans in Hawai'i.

Second, colonialism involves economic exploitation of the colony's natural resources, including cheap labor, and using the colony as a forced market for finished products. This was true in the Solomons, and economically, Hawai'i is clearly still a colony of the United States.

Third, colonialism involves suppression of indigenous cultures and languages because they are a hindrance to the process of exploitation. Moreover, they are seen to stand in the way of progress and development for the local "natives," or of their assimilation into the culture of the dominating political power. In the Solomons as in Hawai'i, the Christian missions and the colonial government worked together to crush our resistance--they called it "pacification"--and to indoctrinate us with British values and ways of thinking--they called it "education." Here in Hawai'i, the Hawaiian language was banned for many decades as a language of instruction, and only recently has it been reintroduced for that purpose for a few public school children in the Hawaiian Language Immersion program.

Fourth, colonialism nearly always includes racism because racism rationalizes the colonial notion that one group is inherently superior to another and therefore has the right of domination. Under colonialism and racism, the subject people become dehumanized, and their lives governed by stereotypes. My people were called savages, natives, black boys, fuzzy-wuzzies. To the white colonialists, we were stubborn, untrustworthy, superstitious, and violent. I grew up hearing stories of Solomons plantation workers too sick with malaria to work in the fields, being beaten by British bosses who thought they were merely lazy. It doesn't pay to resist the white overlords, of course. When a Solomon Islander tried to organize a worker's union to prevent this kind of thing from happening, and to improve working conditions generally, he was labeled a troublemaker and a psychotic by the British government, and laborers from both the private and public sector who joined him forfeited their jobs.

Today in Hawai'i we have just seen that it is acceptable for whites and Asian-Americans to limit the rights of Hawaiians (for instance, to prevent them from having the right to sue the State). But, when a Hawaiian woman, Haunani-Kay Trask, exercises her academic freedom to speak out about oppression, she is attacked from all sides, called a racist, and threatened with loss of her job.

Some of you do not understand the frustration and anger that oppressed people feel. I have written about colonialism and I have lived under colonialism. And let me tell you, the two are not the same. Writing about colonialism from an academic point of view is very different from living under it. We in the Third World who are struggling against colonialism, neocolonialism, and the internal colonialism of postcolonial elites, appreciate the support and good work of leftist academics and political activists who, living in colonizing countries, have the courage to write against colonialism and racism. But they need to realize that they can never understand the impact colonialism and racism have on those of us who suffer under it. They don't know the depth of humiliation that comes with being called a primitive, or being told that your value and intellectual capacity is less than that of white people.

Fifteen years ago I came to study in the "land of the free." Americans liberated my country from the Japanese in World War II, and the soldiers told us all about American democracy. To this day, older Solomon Islanders idealize America. They wish that Americans rather than the British had colonized them. They think things would have been different. They haven't been to Hawai'i.

Imagine my surprise when I first came to Hawai'i in 1974, and discovered that native Hawaiians were an oppressed minority in their own country, and that their lawfully constituted government was overthrown by Americans in the late 1800s. American soldiers had told us that we could throw off British control just as they had in the American Revolution. They didn't tell us that Americans had massacred the native peoples on the Mainland, and turned Hawai'i into a permanent colony.

Despite their claim to be a center of liberal and rational thought, and equal opportunity, universities in the United States reproduce the colonialism and racism of the larger society. They do so in their bureaucratic and academic structures, in what they define as knowledge, in the way that knowledge is generated in universities, and in the pedagogical apparatus through which that knowledge is transmitted.

The University of Hawai'i is a state school whose mission is to serve the local community. Yet the University is oddly remote from its community. The ethnic composition of its faculty--as so many have pointed out before me--is overwhelmingly white. The gender composition of its faculty is overwhelmingly male. For all of the public statements that administrators have made about the University's commitment to justice and racial equity, there has been

remarkably little action. In fact, everything about the University of Hawai'i reflects its origin in white male Mainland culture.

A characteristic of education under colonialism is that knowledge is defined and controlled by the colonizing power. The colonized are required to learn what the colonizers define as knowledge. Local knowledge--that is, knowledge of the subject culture--is devalued and sometimes outlawed. It is the colonizers who have the right to generate new knowledge, not the subject people. Information about the condition of being colonized is always restricted in a colonial institution.

I came to America for higher education because I wanted a different educational experience from the British schooling of the Solomons, where we learned how Europeans had "discovered" the Pacific--as if islanders were merely part of the flora and fauna instead of explorers themselves. Our British teachers saw to it that we learned all about the heroism of European wars and aggression, but they taught us almost nothing of island history. We read Western philosophy--and, though you might not believe it from the recent speeches and behavior of faculty in the Philosophy department here at UH, there's a lot to be learned from Western philosophy. But every culture produces great thinkers and great ideas. Every culture except ours, as our teachers saw it.

I have found higher education in the US to be a liberating experience, and I have had some excellent teachers at UH. Yet most of what I have learned of the truth of colonialism in the Pacific has come not from the classroom, but from my own reading in the library.

What are the patterns of colonialism I see repeated here at the University of Hawai'i? First, understand that I'm not arguing against good scholarship or good science, because I believe in these things. But for people of color, succeeding in the university carries with it the danger of being reshaped to think like white males think, and to lose the unique perspective of one's own culture. The goal should be to become bicultural and to retain one's ability to critique. But that's very difficult to do.

One of my concerns is that scholarship and science are defined very narrowly in the university, so narrowly as to to close out alternatives and diversity. Related to this, faculty attitudes towards students of color automatically place such students at a disadvantage. Students' intelligence and excellence are typically measured by *haole* schema--which include being quick with words and articulate in class, being fluent in *haole* forms of discourse,

mastering *haole* versions of theory and method, knowing the stock of background knowledge that *haole* already know, and competing and debating in the context of *haole* values and expectations. Other forms of knowledge, and other ways of expressing what is known, are excluded from university discourse, and treated as inappropriate, irrelevant, unscientific, and meaningless.

Of course, it is not only forms of knowledge, but who is seen to have the important knowledge. I have repeatedly observed in my classes that great interest is shown by the professor when a white student wants to report his or her experiences in a Third World country. The professor listens attentively, and asks the student lots of questions. But when a Third World student wants to talk about personal experience, the professor typically shows less interest and asks few questions. Why is the experience of people of color less important than the experience of white people? Why are the white outsider's observations of more value than those of an insider who happens to be a person of color? Why is it assumed that the outside observer is a better observer than the insider?

Similarly, I have repeatedly noticed that white professors tend to take more time during office hours with a white student than with a student of color. Is this just my imagination? No, this is an issue that I have discussed not only with other students of color, but also with white students. This issue may sound rather trivial to some of you, but I raise it because last week Prof. Kathryn Takara called for her colleagues to mentor students of color.

The university is colonial in another way that speakers preceding me [last week] have already pointed out. Far from being a bastion of the leftist "politically correct," as conservatives charge, to a Third World student the university is most often a bastion of apology for the terror, domination, and destruction of native peoples. Here in the US, we are far more likely to hear about Nazi Germany or Japanese persecution of the Chinese than to hear about the genocide, aggression, racism, and colonialism of white America against its own ethnic minorities, its territories, and its Third World targets.

The ways in which colonialism and racism are practiced daily on this campus would make a very long list. Some are subtle and others obvious--but all are recognized and felt by students of color. I am glad of the opportunity to speak tonight, and I'd like to express my appreciation to the Matsunaga Institute for Peace for organizing these forums over the past month. Clearly, our campus needs to have more public discussions of race, colonialism, and related

topics. The issues we're addressing are not new, nor are they unique to this university. The way the University of Hawai'i has handled the Maivan Lam case, the sexual harassment issue, the Carter/Trask debate, affirmative action, and recruitment of minority especially native Hawaiian students, has been extremely discouraging. I don't think we can count on change being initiated from the top at this university. If we want something to change, then we--students, staff, and faculty--have to unite and work to bring it about.

FORUM 6

Class, Ethnic Identity, Culture and Education in Hawai'i

March 14, 1991

MODERATOR

Ron Cambra

PANELISTS

James Harpstrite

Wally Ryan Kuroiwa

Jon Matsuoka

Davianna McGregor

Charlene Sato

Roundtable Report

Introduction

Ron Cambra

THE SIXTH public forum was entitled "Class, Ethnic Identity, Culture, and Education in Hawai'i," and was designed as public roundtable discussions. Led by scholars from five different academic disciplines, the focus of the roundtable discussions was the search for ethnic peace. The larger Kuykendall Auditorium audience was invited to select from three different topic groups and to participate in a one-hour sharing of ideas and feelings. After each topic group discussion, the five scholars were invited to share with the larger reunited audience the nature of the discussion within the smaller groups and to offer perspectives on the topics.

The first topic group discussion about "Class and Education" was led by Professor Davianna McGregor and Professor James Harpstrite. Professor McGregor is an assistant professor in Ethnic Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, teaches courses in Hawaiian labor history, and is active in several Hawaiian organizations. Professor Harpstrite is a member of the curriculum research and development group, teaches courses in ethnicity and race in education, and was formerly with the Kamehameha Schools.

Our second topic group on "Language and Culture" was led by Professor Charlene Sato. Professor Sato is an associate professor in the department of English as a second language. Her research and teaching have focused on second language acquisition, and pidgin and creole studies.

Our final group dealt with "Religion and Ethnic Identity" and was led by Professor Jon Matsuoka and the Rev. Dr. Ryan Kuroiwa. Professor Matsuoka is an assistant professor of social work who teaches courses in mental health and cultural diversity. He serves on several community organizations dealing with mental health in the community. Rev. Kuroiwa is senior pastor at the

Nu'uanu Congregational Church and has taught in a variety of settings including a seminary, a university, and a medical school.

What follows is a transcription of the presentations of the discussion leaders after their group discussions. While the topics varied, the quest for common understanding and insight remained throughout all of the discussions and presentations. The exciting point about this approach was that people shared ideas with each other, a first step in the quest for ethnic peace.

I. Language and Culture

Professor Sato: This is not going to do justice to the discussion; because I was so involved in it that I didn't take such good notes, I won't be able to summarize its diversity. But bear with me and I will try to come up with some of the general themes of the discussion.

We did have some disagreements, and these disagreements emerged as we laid out some of the groundwork about what pidgin is, how it is used, and what its history is, and so on. We had some definitional discussions about what the difference is between pidgin and creole, and how the discussion about pidgin in this community has been affected by the fact that there is an important distinction between pidgin and creole languages.

The question of pidgin as a marker of identity, whether class identity, ethnic identity, local identity--that question really underpinned most of the discussion. There is some question whether, given the state of the community now, where we have more varieties of English, of languages, that things have changed, in that people experience not as much oppression, not as much suppression, of pidgin and the use of it in the community. On the part of education, the teachers, parents, and so on, probably are now not as strict about the use of pidgin by children, and that is a change for the better.

However, a number of people in the group felt that it was still a problem in their lives, that as professionals, as people at the university, as faculty, as students, that we still are confronted by the question of whether we can use pidgin at all and whether we can use it in the classroom as teachers. Here we had some disagreement. Some people said, no, absolutely not. We're role models as teachers. If we can use pidgin, that's fine, but it's not what we should be doing in the classroom at the university, where we need to provide some modeling.

A related question that came up had to do with whether it was condescending for such a *haole* faculty as we have here at the university to use pidgin in the classroom, either as a way of establishing rapport or as a way of trying to open communication lines. Some felt yes, it was a good idea, and others felt no, it was very condescending for somebody who was not a pidgin speaker to try to use it. We really had some basic disagreements about that.

A couple of people pointed out that there are still problems in schooling, having to do with the role of pidgin in schooling. For example, when people from the university who deal with pidgin--Hawaiian Creole English--have teacher training workshops, and so on, we still find teachers categorizing children who are monolingual Hawaiian Creole English speakers--who only speak pidgin--as learning disabled. That's really surprising to me and very upsetting, given the amount of information that is available currently that Hawaiian Creole English is a legitimate, normal language and that speakers are fully mature, cognitive beings, that we still have in the teaching population misunderstandings of the connections between speaking pidgin and being learning disabled. That obviously is still a problem.

We also came back to questions about the political value and political symbolism expressed by pidgin. Some concrete suggestions were made, at least for the university, that if we were in fact interested in cultural diversity and in recognizing the legitimacy of indigenous languages and cultures, and so on, that people who come to the university as faculty or administrators or staff or whatever might be required to take courses in Hawaiian Creole English. One participant suggested that faculty might not be given tenure without passing some courses in Hawaiian Creole English, and presumably we could even add Hawaiian to that.

There were some questions about some concrete things that the university might do to recognize in fact that pidgin, Hawaiian Creole English, is a legitimate language, putting our money where our mouths are. Other people felt that it was not a worthwhile enterprise, and in fact that pidgin really doesn't have a place at the university; that it's fine for people to use to communicate with each other, but not really something that we should be dealing with here.

II. Class and Education

Professor Harpstrite: We had excellent response by participants as we tried to focus on relationships between class and ethnicity. We looked at a number of concerns and needs. I think one area was

the area of higher education. One participant indicated that we still are a university which reflects a white male sector; that we need to reflect a much broader element of our community, and probably need to conduct much more in affirmative action. Another participant looked at the need to build community, at the very fact that decisions are really made in a top-down fashion and made on a large bureaucratic statewide system. There may be a need to put decisions in the neighborhoods and indeed to look at home-rule questions.

We looked at the problems of poverty, whether or not a healthy Hawaiian was a rich Hawaiian, as one participant indicated. We also took a look at the role of the university in promoting both the success and ratio of Hawaiian students in the university.

Professor McGregor: We also looked at the processes as they impact on different levels of education. At lower education in the public school system, there is a lack of funding to rural area schools, where there is also an overlapping of the lack of economic opportunity. And also in particular we looked at the lack of budgeting for counseling programs for students, to broaden their horizons to look for careers that are more upwardly mobile, rather than to be content with the options that are available to them in the community. We also looked at the need for families to be more involved in education, involving families to promote the success of children in the schools. That involves at the university level offering programs for the nontraditional student and adult education students, where families can begin to give support to children, for that is where the imbalance usually starts.

We also discussed imbalances in the teacher ratio ethnically and the efforts of the College of Education to try to change that traditional imbalance. It used to be 95 percent Japanese, and now is 50 percent, but it still needs to do more in drawing underrepresented groups into the teacher workforce to match the ethnic proportion of students in the schools.

Professor Harpstrite: I might add that we looked at some empowerment questions. I know that during the question and answer session one of the members of our roundtable was very much concerned that we need to empower the Hawaiian community. For example, the Bishop Estate controls the land resources. It's an institution that is there to perpetuate their culture, they have a two billion dollar estate, and they have an obligation to work with

Hawaiian children, and much more is needed to be done. We also might not be reflecting the concern that was raised by a participant. I think that his statistic was that 85 percent of those in O'ahu prison are of Hawaiian ancestry, and if we look at the poverty sector in the state and the health statistics, they also would reflect that imbalance.

From the positive side we also looked at how the university is very positively taking steps, such as its program in the medical school to bring about minority doctors. We can count on both our hands the number of doctors graduated in the past few years. Every attempt is being made there. Almost every college or school is looking at working with underrepresented minorities. We also looked at the problems that poverty reflects in fragmenting the community into a new underclass.

Then we looked at a specific problem--the geothermal issue--that has divided the state and the communities. It has gone across lines, and what can we do to address the problem in terms of education. For example, the schools throughout the state don't look at economic planning in the sense that there could be communities that could be sustainable. They could look at alternative sources. There may not be a need for the power generated, unless we continue to accept the position of the ideology of the state: a high-growth economy is essential. So essentially we covered a broad basis. I know we probably haven't done justice to the comments.

Professor McGregor: I think the other area was that people had expressed a concern for diversity in education, that the educational curriculum needs to reflect the diversity of ethnic groups to allow for the perpetuation of different languages, of different language backgrounds, and also different cultural backgrounds, and to integrate diversity into the school curriculum.

The other area, aside from geothermal concerns, is that there is an overlapping dichotomy between urban and rural areas and urban and rural concerns, with the Hawaiian concerns overlapping with the rural concerns. But sometimes the dichotomy is along class lines, and also those class lines break down into urban-rural divisions, with the rural divisions overlapping the Hawaiian concerns.

III. Ethnic Identity and Religion

Professor Matsuoka: We had the task of fusing together ethnic identity and religion, and the discussion, as lively as it was, with a

lot of participation, may have jumped around at times; so if my reporting seems to be somewhat jumbled, that's because it reflects the jumping from topic to topic. I'll try as much as possible to look for synapses between some of these concerns.

The first question that was brought to the fore was what is ethnicity, and that inspired a lot of comments. One of the comments was that ethnicity was a very complicated concept, that in this day and age of multicultural environments it is difficult to identify with one particular racial group, especially if you happen to be biracial. In terms of ethnicity what exactly does that mean in the context of Hawai'i, especially again if you're biracial. In particular when your ancestors came from a different country and you are born and raised in the context of Hawai'i, where exactly do you identify yourself.

There was also a comment about ethnicity or ethnic identity as not being a static concept, but something in a constant state of evolution. The example that was used was Japanese nationals coming to Hawai'i and realizing that local Japanese are in a time warp, that they're practicing customs that have disappeared long ago in Japan. So there is that kind of social dynamic that differentiates one's culture in a different context from that culture in the presumed homeland.

Then we moved on to the notion of acculturation. There was a comment made about Western culture and the process in time of rewards and punishments, that systematically we all become part of the white American mainstream. We are all rewarded for certain kinds of behavior, whether it be verbosity in a classroom or certain behavioral styles, or whatever. On the flip side of that, we are systematically punished or not rewarded for other kinds of behavior. Those behaviors that we are punished for tend to reflect our culture, our traditional culture.

There was also a comment made that in homogeneous societies, this notion of ethnic differentiation doesn't exist, and because it doesn't exist, people rely upon other means by which to discriminate against other people. Some of the examples that were made referred to classes, religious orientations, whether or not you're a housewife versus someone who's ambitious and career oriented. So it kind of raises the question of whether or not discrimination is a natural part of any society; if we can't find it in terms of racial differences, we look for it in terms of other kinds of ways to separate people.

Jumping back to this other idea about acculturation, another comment was made--I think was made in reference to the human

race--that we all need to look at ourselves as members of the human race. In response to that comment, another comment was made to look at what that meant: what does it mean when people of color or ethnic minority aspire to become part of the middle class. Some might suspect that means selling out, that means buying into white, dominant society and adhering to all the rules and cultural standards that go along with that.

Finally what I've derived from our discussion is that ethnicity and religion--there was also a lot of talk about religion and spirituality--is that ethnicity and religion is something that becomes even more critically important when we are confronted with the prospect of losing it, when we're being discriminated against because of the racial group or ethnic group that we belong to, or because we believe in a certain religious belief system. If it were not threatened, maybe its something beyond awareness, something that we are so adept at, or we take for granted, or part of our daily life, that we're not aware that somebody's threatening our ethnicity. Therefore it becomes more important when we feel like we're on the verge of losing it.

Rev. Kuroiwa: I think part of the reason the discussion was so freewheeling was that about three minutes into the discussion, Jon and I lost control of the group, so it tended to go wherever the group wanted it to go. But when we did have control we went around and identified ourselves, and it's very interesting to me that part of the way in which people identified themselves--these were people from all over our world, it was a very international group--but people took time to particularize their identity in terms of their religious background, and that led me to the conclusion that religion was an important part of their personal identity, as well as an important cultural identifying factor.

There are some questions that dealt directly with religion that I wanted to add to Jon's summary. Most of the questions dealt particularly with Christianity, for one reason or another, although some of the same questions could be applied to other religions as well. But one of the questions that surfaced was whether Christianity is a white religion that is imposed upon other cultural groups, with specific reference to the dynamics of the missionary movement here in Hawai'i. A corollary to that is whether religion is a legitimizing tool for those who hold economic, political, and social power, whether that is an essential way that you can define religion, which is a way in which Marx identified religion.

Then we rambled on to talk about religion as an essential part of a culture, with the particular question being: if we reject the particular religious majority of our culture, does that mean we reject the culture as well. I think that's a question worth pursuing for many hours. I'm not sure that we came up with a consensus on that.

One other essential aspect of the discussion concerned how religion is transmitted. That is, if religion is transmitted in the form of a story, that is the most powerful and dramatic form in which religion is passed on from one generation to the next, and it becomes very much a part of the cultural story. I think that was a very valuable insight of the group.

FORUM 7

The Search for Ethnic Peace in Hawai'i

March 21, 1991

MODERATOR

Luciano Minerbi

PANELISTS

Ron Cambra

Farabi

Sheila Forman

Steven Ito

'Alohilani Kuala

Franklin S. Odo

Barbara Siegel

Majid Tehranian

Mary Tiles

Donald M. Topping

Academic Freedom

MAJID TEHRANIAN

I REALIZE that I face an exceptionally hazardous task, and I ask for your indulgence. First, I have to summarize what my four valued colleagues have said so eloquently and courageously in some detail on a topic as sensitive as academic freedom. Second, in our common search for ethnic peace and justice in Hawai'i, I am also charged with the responsibility of seeking a common ground between what appears to be incompatible philosophical and political positions. Last but not least, I have to do all of this in ten minutes!

Before I embark on this enterprise, may I admit my own blatant prejudices. I must confess that I have found the current controversy on academic freedom and responsibility a most refreshing change from the rather sleepy intellectual atmosphere of our university in the past decade. But the whole country appeared to be sleepwalking during the yuppie eighties. The controversy here at UH seems to have accomplished at least one thing. It has turned one of the world's dullest student newspapers into one of the liveliest. My first and foremost reaction is therefore to thank Haunani, Joey Carter, the Philosophy Department, and the editors of *Ka Leo* for their contributions to this debate. We owe a special debt of gratitude to Haunani for carrying the banner during the whole of the past decade on behalf of the rights of native Hawaiians and a more just and therefore more truly free and peaceful university. I am delighted to see that the President and the Faculty Senate have wisely declined to consider the Philosophy Department's demands for Haunani's dismissal. But I hope that does not mean a return to business as usual. We need a more reasoned and serious discourse among faculty, students, and administrators on the fundamental issues of academic freedom, responsibility, racism, and sexism that the controversy has raised. If the university community is intimidated into silence and does not engage in the art of controversy, society as a whole will suffer incalculable costs. I know this because I taught at universities in

Iran during the seventies, where an administered silence brought about a revolutionary explosion. The price of peace, freedom, and justice is eternal vigilance.

The university here as elsewhere has three central educational functions to perform in society, involving what might be called *additive, regenerative,* and *transformative* learning. Additive learning consists of the transfer of human knowledge and skills from generation to generation in an accumulative process over time. Regenerative learning involves the transfer of human values in socialization processes in which every generation relearns through its own experiences and sufferings the moral lessons of the past while confronting the challenges of the present and the future. Transformative learning focuses on the development of the capacity for critical and creative thinking, including research, innovation, and social restructuring. Freedom is vital to the conduct of all three functions, but academic freedom is particularly important to the performance of the last function. This function requires that the university, its faculty, students, and administrators act as intellectual watchdogs (even gadflies) of society and its institutions, critique that which seems to be destructive of the general welfare, and propose alterative normative and social structures. The institution of tenure is uniquely designed to facilitate this university function through a guarantee of the rights of academic freedom to its faculty, in order to protect them from the punitive hand of administrative authorities.

My four esteemed colleagues on the panel on academic freedom each provided a different but thoughtful perspective. At the risk of over-simplifying their rich presentations, may I reduce each perspective to a single central proposition. Ken Kipnis argued that there is no freedom where there is no responsibility. He suggested that the grant of tenure and academic freedom by the university management implies a special code of conduct and responsibility for the university faculty, including a respectful treatment of students. Haunani-Kay Trask, by contrast, argued that there is no freedom where there is no social justice. In a semicolonial university such as the University of Hawai'i, she suggested, where a predominantly white, male faculty and administration dominates a predominantly nonwhite and female student population, to expose the colonial past and the racist present is part of her rights of academic freedom and teaching responsibilities. Identifying the three distinctly different discourses of academic freedom, anticolonialism, and feminism in the debate, Kathy Ferguson argued that there is no freedom where there is no vigorous public discourse. She thus welcomed the

current controversy as a healthy sign of intellectual life at our university. Peter Manicas concluded the discussion by arguing that there is no freedom where politically correct speech limits freedom of speech. He warned us all against a hasty prohibition against hateful speech because there are, in fact, no limits to what can be considered objectionable by any number of groups in society. At universities in particular, Peter suggested, freedom of speech must enjoy a maximum latitude because the intellectual life of the university and its critical functions in society vitally depend on debate and controversy.

Where does all this lead us to? Back to Alexis De Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*. De Tocqueville, as you recall, distinguished between liberty and equality as the two complementary and contradictory drives in democratic societies. I would like to suggest a third force, which has increasingly become more obvious and powerful in our own times, the need for community, for roots, and for cultural identity in an increasingly abstract and anonymous world. The disintegration of indigenous communities in the colonial and postcolonial worlds, and the alienation of the individual from common bonds of social solidarity in the industrial and postindustrial worlds, has produced a worldwide yearning for roots. As liberty has often been sacrificed at the altar of equality in totalitarian societies, both liberty and equality can be sacrificed at the altar of communal bonds and a fetish of identity. Tyrannies of majorities and minorities are in full swing when any single value is exclusively privileged over all others.

But as the French revolutionary slogans of liberté, égalité, and fraternité remind us, liberty, equality, and community are all indispensable conditions for democracy. The tensions among them can be creative or destructive, depending on how well we manage to let these forces interplay on the social scene. A fetish of freedom to the exclusion of considerations of equality and community would lead us to what we have witnessed during the Reagan-Bush years, a democracy driven to self-destruction by increasing class and racial antagonisms while pursuing imperial military projects. A fetish of equality to the exclusion of considerations of freedom and community would lead us to what we have witnessed in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe--tottering totalitarian societies torn by economic stagnation and ethnic turmoil. A fetish of identity and community to the exclusion of considerations of freedom and equality would lead us to what we are witnessing in some Third World societies such as Iran, Lebanon, India, or Sri Lanka where

religious, racial, ethnic, or linguistic bigotry and tyranny sometimes dominate the passions and actions in society.

Where is the place of university in all of this? The university, as the name suggests, is a *universal* institution. It must remain faithful to all the universal human values, to the traditions of civility and perennial philosophy handed down to us from Hammurabi's first legal code on the clay tablets in Babylon, to Alexandria's papyrus library, the Athenian Academy in Greece, the Sassanid medical academies in Iran, the Islamic Madrassa, the Buddhist Pagodas in India and China, and the modern universities in Padua, Oxford, Göttingen, and Paris. I mention all these places in order to demonstrate that Western civilization has served only as a link in a never-ending chain to uphold the traditions of civility embedded in higher education. The university as a universal institution must reinforce what the forgotten motto of University of Hawai'i upholds: *Maluna a'e o nā lāhui a pau ke ola ke kanaka*--Above all nations is humanity.

This university, more than most that I have known, is characterized by two extraordinary features. On the one hand, the University of Hawai'i is one of the most, if not the most, multiethnic academic communities in the world. We must not only tolerate and respect but also celebrate these differences. On the other hand, as primarily a commuting institution, the University of Hawai'i seems to lack a sense of community more than residential institutions of higher learning. Because of our colonial past, fragmented ethnic presence, and commuting style of life, we must work harder at developing a sense of common purpose here. The colonial structures of this university must change before its multiethnic composition can fully blossom into a thousand flowers. The ethnic and gender composition of faculty, students, and administrators must more adequately represent Hawai'i's ethnic diversity before a sense of justice can be restored.

Freedom ultimately means both negative and positive freedom, freedom from both external and internal constraints, freedom *from* as well as *to*. To achieve academic freedom in a true sense we need to establish a community of shared values and common purpose from which we can engage in common intellectual and moral enterprises. To build a more solid foundation for a community of scholars at the University of Hawai'i, I propose that we create a residential or quasi-residential college to pursue the following goals: 1) to bring together interested faculty, students,

and administrators in an intense dialogue and participation in common educational and research projects, 2) to do so free from the constraints of normal and routine academic requirements such as courses and grades, and 3) thereby to act as a catalyst as well as a magnet for the rest of the university in our common pursuits of knowledge, civility, and hopefully, wisdom.

Let me conclude. Freedom without justice and community brings about alienation. Community without freedom and justice often leads to tyranny. The university must be a community of scholars founded on freedom and justice.

The University's Responsibility Toward Students

MARY TILES

IT HAS been suggested that the problems of this university are structural and institutional, having to do with its colonial origins, with the perpetuation of that role, and with the fact that the student body is increasingly made up of so-called nontraditional students, who must juggle classes with off-campus work and other commitments. The difficulties and hazards of trying to effect changes in these circumstances were illustrated by Susan Hippensteele in her discussion of the sexual harassment issue. She expressed both disillusionment and frustration that so much effort and activity on the part of herself and others had not only not resolved the original problems but seemed actually to be resulting in measures which have no hope of producing changes at the level which really matters--changes at the level of personal relations, habits, and attitudes. A legalistic framework of definitions, codes of behavior, and adversarial grievance procedures is an institutional response to the problem, but such a response is premised on, and serves only to further entrench, the aggressive, intimidating, and combative atmosphere which lies at the root of many of the sexual harassment and racial problems--the atmosphere which many of us would like to dispel. The university will not be realizing its responsibility toward students until respect for them is manifest in, and is a part of the fabric of, its routine organizational and educational practices.

If the institutional, bureaucratic route does not work, what other avenues should be explored? It would be rash indeed to suggest that one had any answers, but I would tentatively offer the following observations.

1. Top-down, legislated measures, being products of the existing institutional framework, are likely only to reproduce it.

2. Radical overthrow of the existing institution is unrealistic. State educational institutions will not be supported and funded unless they are at least perceived to be serving the interests of those holding political power. This has been amply demonstrated by educational reforms in the United Kingdom initiated by Mrs Thatcher; these have included abolishing the system of academic tenure for all new appointees, including those accepting promotions.

3. Education is inevitably ideological. The question is what ideology should be informing our educational practices. The idea of a liberal education is an integral part of the American value system. Should it be questioned along with the questioning of colonialism and cultural imperialism? Perhaps so, but then there would need to be discussion about what alternative would be appropriate. Would the imposition of any other cultural ideology be more or less likely to respect the interests of the existing diverse student body? Do the inequities and shortcomings of the institution as it now exists stem from its formation under the conception of the goals of a liberal education?

4. There is reason to think that this is not the case. There is at present a disparity between the official ideology of liberal education and the ideology that informs actual educational practices, practices designed more to instill the values of liberal individualism than to develop the abilities necessary for the full social realization of those values. Liberal education can also be construed as education for liberation (as by some Latin American writers).

This suggests that one should at least continue pursuit of a nonovert, nonbureaucratic bottom-up strategy of putting the official ideology into practice, working to bring into being educational practices which genuinely empower those going through the educational process by developing both intellectual abilities and self-confidence (and I know that there are individual faculty members who already work hard at this). This means, among other things, ceasing to regard the educational process as simply a matter of a transfer of knowledge and skills from faculty to students--there is a two-way street here. Prerequisites for extending such practices beyond the classrooms of isolated individual faculty members would be the establishment of nonbureaucratic forums for faculty-student dialogue and for cross-departmental dialogue between faculty. I realize that opening up such channels of communication on this campus is a far from easy task. But I put it forward as a project which might be an appropriate follow-up to a series such as this.

Racism and the University: The Search for Ethnic Peace

FRANKLIN S. ODO

THE MOVEMENT to establish ethnic studies courses and units on college and university campuses across the nation occurred in the late 1960s and into the 1970s. This effort, led by students, a few faculty members, and community activists, was built on the realization that American higher education had failed to provide appropriate intellectual understanding of the major destabilizing forces of the time: the civil rights movement and the struggle to end the war in Southeast Asia. Two decades later, with students currently enrolled who were not yet born when the earlier struggles took place, it is sometimes difficult to remember the thoroughgoing critique of the university as the production point, repository, and transmission center of the racist ideology which rationalized and buttressed (if indeed it had not created) white supremacist institutions at home and the anti-Asian war machine in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. So while it may appear disingenuous to be saying this as the Director and Professor of the now permanent Ethnic Studies Program at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, it nevertheless needs to be said that here, as elsewhere, institutional racism is little changed from that of two decades ago.

Of course, now as then, there are individual faculty and administrators who are consciously battling this racism and they may be found in different departments and areas at every campus. The March 22 issue of the *Ka Leo* student newspaper will reveal that fewer than one-half of the UH-Mānoa students feel there is "a climate or atmosphere of racism on the university campus." About 3 percent gave no opinion. Most of the European Americans (55 percent) and Hawaiians (57 percent) felt there was a climate of racism, while 62 percent of the Japanese Americans disagreed. This is an interesting departure from a *Ka Leo* poll of November 1990, in

which 74 percent of the students agreed with the statement that "racial discrimination on the UH campus is an issue that needs attention and action." (Tom Brislin, *Ka Leo* poll # 3, March 1991--summary notes)

The title of our forum is the search for ethnic peace in Hawai'i, and I thought I would make an attempt at short answer propositions for such an endeavor. Assuming that peace will only come with justice, and realizing that ethnicity is only one of several major variables that need to be addressed (race, class, age, gender, sexual orientation, and the environment are obvious others), I would suggest the following:

1. Support the establishment of a Hawaiian nation.
2. Require every major institution functioning in Hawai'i to establish a plan to address this issue for itself. These would include but not be limited to: the military, the tourist industry and all of its components, labor unions, all branches of the government, all sectors of the education system, the media, and private sector units such as financial institutions. Have these plans evaluated by constituents and clients of those institutions. Thus, for example, Castle and Cooke would need to draft such a plan with all of Lāna'i's residents and the Air Force would need to consult with people in Waimānalo regarding use of Bellows Field. Similarly, the Mānoa campus would need to acknowledge its constituent parts and the clientele it purports to serve. Since we are part of the Mānoa campus, let me explore this process and suggest some points for implementation.

I believe this is a useful exercise because it will help focus attention on the sometimes bewildering complexity of a major university campus. It is fashionable if usually rhetorical to begin with students, so I suppose we could divide them into graduate and undergraduate categories, although you would soon learn that those who commute may have different concerns from those who dorm. And students specifically recruited as athletes will surely have specific problems; so will students from different backgrounds. Whatever their unique qualities, they would benefit from some knowledge of and direct connection to the communities beyond the campus, so it might make sense to require competence in this area prior to graduation or certification.

If we proceed to what most people would consider the governing body or policy setting unit, the Board of Regents, we might ask how they are constituted or who, indeed, they are.

Interestingly, the current UH Mānoa Bulletin does not include their names; you will, however, find all eleven listed in the university telephone directory. There are many other offices on this campus and I would suggest, at a minimum, that the following be included: president, vice presidents, deans, chairs, faculty, coaches and trainers, administrative, professional and technical appointments (APTs), clerical, and facilities personnel.

I suggest these two courses of action because they seem to me to be the most direct ways to encourage positive and thoroughgoing confrontation with the pernicious and persistent forms of racism and insensitivity that pervades our university. Asking people to support self-determination for Native Hawaiians will require dialogue and reflection as we try to determine the historical and contemporary conditions that make sovereignty claims politically and morally just. This vital issue brings us all "home" to consider who we are and the roles we see before us; not only with respect to Native Hawaiians but in the context of all of Hawai'i as well as the nation and the world. In this sense, the question of justice for Native Hawaiians can serve as a catalyst for consideration of the kind of society we want to create for ourselves. This quest will take us inevitably into the arena of peace and reasonable relations among all ethnic groups.

The suggestion that discrete units of the Mānoa campus discuss the question would not be very difficult to implement. The Board of Regents, the President's staff, the Vice Presidents and the Council of Deans meet regularly and could place the issue of ethnic peace on their agendas. The Faculty Senate could do the same and the departments and programs could be asked to discuss the issue and summarize their discussions for consideration. The Associated Students of the University of Hawaii (ASUH) might sponsor a series of forums to this end. The major unions--the United Public Workers (UPW), Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA), and the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly (UHPA)--could all assume responsibility for membership discussions. I suggest that this apparently simple exercise will accomplish a variety of goals.

First, it will surface issues hidden within the structure of these units themselves, whether among faculty or between departments or in the Graduate Students Organization (GSO). This will trigger a process that will exacerbate some problems but will be essential to the resolution of interracial and interethnic problems. Second, it will help dispel the notion that ethnic tensions can be ignored and that

these problems are limited to circumscribed arenas within our campus or in our society. Finally, open discussions will alert all participants to the fact that these are issues confronting the entire globe and that they are susceptible to resolution at levels ranging from the intensely personal to the institutional and societal.

Hawai'i is a complex place. It is made infinitely more difficult to comprehend because there are two shared mythologies; the first is that most of us who live here recognize the difficulties involved in ethnic and race relations and are doing about as well as could be expected given the circumstances; and, second, that no good can or will come out of direct confrontation with the problems at hand--that "local" styles of conflict resolution involving subtle or indirect approaches are the only ones capable achieving any positive results. The first is given currency by the ample examples of violence and conflict nearly everywhere else in the world, from Brooklyn to Los Angeles to Fiji to Yugoslavia. This myth feeds on the extreme problems evident in other locales and fuels a fatalism and cynicism destructive to our society.

The second myth is more difficult to apprehend. It is true that "mainland" or "haole" approaches to problem solving often engender passive resistance among "local" colleagues resulting in frustration and anger on all sides. But it is too easy to conclude, therefore, that direct or even confrontational behaviors are culturally inappropriate in conflict situations; this is clearly evident when considering young male behavior. There are surely questions of appropriateness in timing, duration, environment, social context, and proper etiquette in initiating or terminating confrontation, but those who are part of the local social fabric know full well the extensive pattern of confrontation and directness that obtains.

The search for ethnic and racial peace on the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa campus will be long and difficult. And since the university is only one part of a larger fabric of ethnic and racial unrest, it will be hard pressed to make substantial progress absent similar movements in other institutions. Nonetheless, there is a tradition of relative autonomy in higher education which allows for freedom to experiment not easily accessed in lower education or other public agencies or in the private sector. It is this relative autonomy which provides the potential and responsibility to pursue the search.

The Search for Ethnic Peace in Hawai'i

DONALD M. TOPPING

THE PANEL that I chaired two weeks ago focused its discussion on the topic of the Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University. My purpose now is to try to show how that topic relates to the general theme of this series of fora: the Search for Ethnic Peace in Hawai'i.

Two of the panelists of our forum of two weeks ago spoke directly from their perspective of being on the colonized end of the colonial experience in the islands of the Pacific. Another gave the view from a "third world" country of the Middle East. Yet another spoke of the colonized people of North America, the American Indians. And the final panelist described modern-day colonialism in its various forms. Running throughout the presentations was the notion that colonialism still haunts us in such forms as job discrimination, exploitation of native lands for military use, tourism, geothermal and other forms of development, and imperialistic wars against third world countries.

But perhaps most relevant for us here at the University of Hawai'i, in which all of us share a part, is the colonialism that comes across in attitudes as expressed through not so subtle forms of behavior and language, both in and outside the classrooms, and that which is reflected in the administrative and professorial structures of the institution.

During the evening's discussion two weeks ago, some ideas were put forward as ways to counter the colonial legacy that was initiated in the last century, and is still with us as we prepare to enter the next. I will relate those that stand out in my memory. But before doing that I would like to offer some additional thoughts that have come to me during the two-week interim.

I have been pondering the question of whether or not it is possible to find any kind of peace in the increasingly warlike

environment of the United States. It seems that the approach of our national and state political leadership is to couch everything in terms of war: the War on Poverty, the War on Crime, the War on Drugs, the War on Illiteracy, and so forth. And according to our leaders in Washington, the only way to achieve peace among nations is through war.

This warlike approach to problems seems to me to reflect the growing culture of militancy and combativeness that increasingly surrounds us. We see it in children's cartoons and toys, video game parlors, in popular television series (for example, "Miami Vice," "L.A. Law," "Magnum P.I."), and in our most popular professional sport--football. We hear more and more of battered wives, police brutality, gang murders, random shootings, and the proliferation of assault weapons throughout our country. The recent collective experience of the televised war, and the subsequent national "wargasm," all suggest that we are living in a world of violence that we have brought upon ourselves. I think it is significant that the fastest growing corporation in the United States today is the Wackenhut Company, whose armed employees may now exceed the total numbers in the military service.

Given the situation as I have just described it, can there be any hope for peace? And are we, in the search for ethnic peace, also resorting to the tactics of war?

In looking at this question, I would like to offer some personal observations which, hopefully, will be received as my effort to make a small contribution to the search for ethnic peace.

First, I would recommend that confrontational, accusatory approaches need to be tempered. From what I have seen over the years, war begets war, accusations beget accusations, and so on. If our goal is to achieve ethnic peace, we must seek peaceful means. There is enough of antagonism and war already.

Let me cite two examples. The first is the frequently heard accusations against anthropologists, archaeologists, historians and linguists who have studied and interpreted Pacific societies. While some of the charges made against contract archaeologists and the early historians may be valid, I do not think they apply to current staff of the University of Hawai'i or the Bishop Museum. At least, I do not know of any. While a number of us gained our Ph.D.s, jobs, and tenure by studying Pacific cultures and languages, I do not feel that this is grounds for condemnation. On the contrary, I am glad to have had the opportunity to study and learn many things of value from Pacific cultures. For me, it has been an enriching

experience. Among the valuable lessons I learned from it was that the colonial experience was a very real and harsh one for the people of the Pacific, the legacy of which is still very much present.

The second example comes from my personal concern with language. It has to do with the accusation against the *haole* missionaries and colonial administrators for having suppressed the Hawaiian language. On the contrary, the missionaries argued strongly for the use of Hawaiian in education as well as governance, and continued to use Hawaiian as the language of instruction in their schools long after the government schools switched to English. While they may be correctly blamed for many wrongs committed throughout the colonial world of the Pacific, including the ridicule and displacement of traditional customs, practices, and beliefs, they should not be blamed for the erosion and near loss of the Hawaiian language.

The critical decision to make English the exclusive language of instruction in the schools of Hawai'i was made not by missionaries, nor by colonial administrators, but by native sons, who in 1878 submitted the following petition to the legislative assembly:

> To lay upon the table a petition presented by Mr. Palohau; one from Mr. Hanuna, and one from Mr. Kupau, asking to have English schools take the place of the Hawaiian; also a bill presented by Mr. Kupau to amend the laws for the same purpose.

Although I don't know who Messrs. Palohau, Hanuna, and Kupau were, their names don't sound *haole* to me.

I am not attempting here to exonerate the *haole* administrators from this history. They were undoubtedly there behind the scenes, which is the way colonialism works. The usual pattern throughout the Pacific has been to coopt a few of the indigenous people and let them carry out the colonial mandate. And it is still going on in Hawai'i, and in many other parts of the world.

The reason I cite these examples is to caution against the practice of sweeping condemnations, which may or may not be accurate. Such a broadbrush approach does not contribute to ethnic peace.

Now to be more specific. What steps can we, the people who make up the University of Hawai'i, take that might contribute to the goal of ethnic peace? I will repeat some of the very sensible and

reasonable suggestions that were put forth at the forum which I moderated, most of them by Dr. Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa.

1. We should all learn something of the history of Hawai'i, and work to correct the misconceptions, inaccuracies, and distortions that have been taught in the classrooms throughout Hawai'i, including those of this university. For that matter, we should learn something of the histories and cultures of all Hawai'i's people in an environment of mutual respect.

2. We should all learn how to pronounce Hawaiian names, both of persons and of places.

3. All people employed by the government of the State of Hawai'i should take Hawaiian Language 101, at a minimum.

4. We must recognize the continued colonialist attitudes that still abound in this community. Furthermore, we need to expose them in our classes and through public fora, such as television, radio, newspapers, and those sponsored by the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace.

5. We must use every opportunity to petition for support for Hawaiian studies, and particularly the Hawaiian language programs. The work being carried out, for example, in the *Punana Leo* program has been courageous, but it needs more support.

6. We must petition equally for more support to learn about other ethnic minorities of our community.

7. We should seek better communication with other people in the Pacific who are going through similar postcolonial problems, perhaps leading to coalitions, as was recommended by Dr. Jackson. (I recommend using the new PEACESAT for this purpose.)

And above all, we must resolve to approach our conflicts, disputes, and differences with a genuine desire to engage in dialogue to learn and understand where the other person is coming from.

In spite of the claims recently heard coming from the lips of Bush, Baker, Powell, and Schwarzkopf, a warlike stance can never lead to peace, neither among nations nor on a university campus.

A Native Hawaiian Basis for University Restructuring

'ALOHILANI KUALA

I WOULD first like to say *mahalo nui* to Professor Haunani-Kay Trask, who could not be here this evening, but who was bold enough to stand up for her people and speak the truth. In doing this Professor Trask has opened a lot of eyes to the history, feelings, and status of the Hawaiian people, and in her effort to educate Joey Carter, she has set the stage for the next cycle in Hawaiian history.

You see, in Hawaiian thought, time is cyclical; it is not linear, as in the Western view. There are no beginnings and no endings, only patterns repeating themselves. Therefore, as Hawaiians, we look to our past to determine our future. With this in mind, let us take a brief look to the past of the Hawaiian people, from our true past, from the pure history of the Hawaiian people.

This was a time when our people were proud. This is a time when in the West sailors were afraid to sail too far from home lest they fall off the edge of the world. But the people of Polynesia were traversing thousands of miles across the Pacific to a new home called Hawai'i iki. During this time the people of Europe commonly died of malnutrition and diseases, while the people of Hawai'i cultivated plants, animals, as well as the food wealths of the sea, and stood perhaps seven feet in stature, strong and dark.

This is a time when our people, our ancestors, would recite from memory genealogies spanning hundreds of years. I could go on and on; what it really comes down to is that this was a time when we knew who we were as a people. We were a proud people.

Then came the next cycle of Hawai'i's history, but this, this is not a time of pride. This has nothing to do with pride. Nor was it a part of our true history. This was a time of loss and shame for the Hawaiian people. In this period our *kupuna* died at amazing rates, by the tens of thousands, from diseases brought here by *ka po'e haole*, the first of which was Captain James Cook.

At this time, amongst the death of half of the Hawaiian race, the missionaries arrived. They came with an explanation for the loss of so many Hawaiian lives. It seems that we had been believing in the wrong gods. According to the missionaries, who insisted they were here to save our souls, the Hawaiian people should turn to the one god, Jehovah. Because our gods were heathen and evil, and because we believed in them and not in Jehovah, our race was dying at such a rapid pace. We began to lose faith in the very gods who gave birth to our race, who carried us thousands of miles in many ocean voyages, and who created our stable and prosperous society. We had lost our gods.

Our *kupuna* were further told that they must wear Western-style clothing; that to wear nothing or very little was sinful in the eyes of god. We lost our mode of dress.

Furthermore, the hula as well as many other cultural practices were no longer allowed, because they were pagan. We lost our culture.

Then in 1893 our queen, Lili'uokalani, was forced by the U.S. military to forfeit the crown and her kingdom. We lost our sovereignty.

Not long after this our language was banned from being spoken in all public schools and our *kupuna* were beaten if caught speaking our native tongue. We lost our language.

And about this time we also began losing our land. The great *māhele* is a prime but in no way solitary example of this. In old Hawai'i, in old Hawaiian thought, there was no concept of private land ownership. Land was given to the people by the gods to be used by all, that all may benefit. However, when foreigners arrived, they discovered that this was a problem for them, because they too were not granted private ownership. Therefore, counselors and advisers, all of whom were *haole,* advised Kamehameha III, to divide the land so that it might be sold for money--money, of course, held by *ka po'e haole*. This time that I have just explained to you was one of great loss and great shame for the Hawaiian people.

In losing everything from our *ākua* to our *āina,* we also lost things much more precious: our identity, our integrity, and our pride. Which brings me right up to the present and future, the next cycle of change.

Hawaiians today are looking to our past for our path to the future. We are looking to the true history of our people, a proud

history, a strong history. It is this history which enables us today to stand up for our right to speak and to teach our native language to our children. And it is this history that strengthens us in our demand for sovereignty. Things have come full circle and Hawaiians will once again stand firm in who we are and stand proud. A time when Hawaiians may freely worship our ancestral gods, practice our once forbidden culture, speak in our native tongue, and live on our native soil.

Now that we have established this, the next issue is how the University of Hawai'i can become a fluid part of this inevitable cyclical change? We at Make'e Pono Lāhui Hawai'i propose that the University of Hawai'i system fulfill its responsibilities to the Hawaiian students of this campus by implementing three major educational programs: a program to educate all students in Hawaiian history, culture, and language; another to educate the administration and faculty in the same; and the implementation of affirmative action in the form of the Madison plan.

In educating the student body population of this campus in the history, culture, and language of the indigenous people of this land, there will grow a clear understanding of the hurt and anger that the Hawaiian people feel today as well as teaching the respect deserving of the host people of this land. In the same respect we also feel that the administration and faculty of the University of Hawai'i, as well as the students they teach, would greatly benefit from the application of a program similar to that founded at Texas A & I to educate the Anglo professors there to understand and be sensitive to the Mexican-American student population. This program is federally funded by a three year, $150,000 grant from the department of education fund for the improvement of postsecondary education. There is no reason why a plan similar to this could not be implemented here, with the same money, the same form, and the same object in mind: to create a better understanding of, and more sensitivity to, our people and what we all face, and of the place we all live in today. The implementation of a similar program in the University of Hawai'i system is not only possible but beneficial and necessary.

Lastly, the production of a program similar to that created at the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus, the Madison plan: The Madison plan is a very thorough, comprehensive, and federally funded plan created to adjust the problems of ethnic inequalities on their campus, including equalizing the relative percentage of

ethnicities represented in the faculty as well as student populations. This also deserves serious research and prompt application in our own university system.

The time of change is definitely upon us. As Hawaiian students in our homeland we will stand firm and we will stand proud. And this university must make a choice either to stand with us or to stand against us.

Perspectives on Racism

STEVEN ITO

IT WOULD seem from personal experiences, both mine and other participants in these forums, that racism exists and is both overt and covert. Racism exists in two closely related forms: individual racism and institutional racism. The difference between the two is not a difference in intent or visibility. Both the individual act of racism and the racist institutional policy may occur without the presence of conscious bigotry, and both may be practiced intentionally or innocently.

During these forums racism has been defined from one of two perspectives: that of the victim and that of the reformed racist. In both, racism is only perceived in others and never in ourselves. Perhaps, like recovering alcoholics, we can and should acknowledge that we are all recovering racists. Like alcoholics, we cannot be on that road to recovery unless we admit to the problem. Perhaps only in doing so might we be able to adequately address the solutions.

Individual racism changes very slowly in our lives, if at all, But institutional racism, which is grounded in individual attitudes and practices, changes even more slowly.

Institutional racism has been studied in the light of the melting pot theory, a theory that has been pretty much dismissed as nonviable. But in many ways, this theory is still being used when we view a majority group as the dominant oppressor and marginalized groups as the oppressed.

Institutional racism is also studied in the light of the tapestry theory. But the analysis cannot simply be majority to minority (or marginalized group), especially here in Hawai'i and soon in the continental United States, as the ethnic demographics begin to change.

Just as the former melting pot theory is outdated, I suspect that the latter is also outdated. This is because of three obstacles. One is the definition of race or ethnicity; the second is the static

nature of our identifying tools; and the third is the identification of institutional and individual racism.

Within each tapestry there are shades and hues of reds, yellows, and browns. I am informed that there are also shades and hues of black. I'm also informed a particular school of artists has indicated that pure white does not exist because it reflects other colors, but we can only take analogies so far.

Analysis and concrete norms tend to exclude individuals not only from the general society, but also from ethnic groupings. This is especially true of multiethnic peoples. We need to make our analysis of racism dynamic, especially in light of the dynamic peoples who make up this state and this institution. We need to include in our analysis the feelings and emotions of people and the values of ourselves as analysts. Feelings and emotions may be messy and hard to objectify, but they exist and we cannot simply dismiss them. Perhaps we need to clearly differentiate between our own feelings of anger and hatred. I believe the latter is like a cancer that eats within us and not just others. We also must acknowledge our own values that we bring to our study. Let us not delude ourselves into thinking that we who practice these disciplines in higher education are value free. We need to be, instead, value explicit.

Finally we seem to drift between individuals we perceive as racist and institutions we perceive as racist. Both can be, and often are, racist simultaneously. But can we be clear about whom and what we are addressing, and whom and what we are trying to affect?

I thank the Spark. M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace for this forum that has initiated the discussions. I hope to see these discussions continue.

Immigrants and Racism

SHEILA FORMAN

OBVIOUSLY SOME of the problems that have been raised during this forum series exist outside the university as well. I'm not really representing these groups, but as Luciano mentioned, I am the executive director of the Catholic Immigration Center, and I'm also on the board of a legal services organization called the Lawyers of the People of Hawai'i.

What I'd like to do today is to just talk briefly about two projects that I will be involved in in the next couple of years in connection with my work with these two agencies, and I think that there are projects that attempt to address in some small way some of those issues of ethnic peace that we have been discussing.

First by way of background: Recently the federal government's General Accounting Office conducted a study of discrimination nationwide against immigrants, and they concluded that there was in fact widespread discrimination against immigrants. And so the Department of Justice as a result of this finding issued some funds and have contracted with us and lots of other states to provide an educational campaign to reach potential victims of discrimination on the basis of foreign appearance and accent. That was one of the things that the GAO study determined, that people who had foreign appearance and accent were denied jobs across the country, including in Hawai'i. So that's one of the things I will be doing in the next couple of years, informing immigrants and refugees of their rights under a specific section of the immigration reform and control act that prohibits this kind of discrimination.

The second project that I will be working on is an attempt to inform immigrants and refugees about Hawaiian issues. I think that in addition to working on some of our own problems and concerns, immigrants do have a responsibility to study issues that are raised by native Hawaiians, so we will be bringing immigrants and refugees together and inviting people to speak on Hawaiian issues. I will be coming to the university and asking some of the people here to come and participate in some of these sessions and to join with me perhaps in both of these projects that I have been talking about.

Baha'i Faith and Ethnic Peace

FARIBA PIROOZMANDI

MY FAITH is Baha'i faith and because of my background, because of my Baha'i faith, I was brought up to look into the diversity of other people and look into the beauty of the diversity of other people and see that if I want to have a complete picture of the world, or if I'm involved in some activity, I will not reach a perfect goal or the reality of a goal unless I bring in diverse thoughts.

It is a difficult task because everyone is different and everybody clings on to their own egos. One of the techniques of the Baha'i faith introduces to people and encourages them to get involved with this, with these actions, with the diversity of other people, by looking to the spirituality of other people. Because a lot of us are afraid of each other, because we're different, we think that if I want to incorporate another way of thinking into my thoughts I will have to give up my own way of thinking, rather than thinking that this different thought is going to in fact accentuate my way of thinking or actually bring about something that I don't know about my own culture--for example, if I use another culture or become friends with other people of diverse groups.

So if I'm afraid of different cultures, if I'm afraid of differences, what I can tap into is the oneness of spirituality among everybody. I can tap into that oneness and out of that when I feel safe with people, and feel that all of us are basically sharing the same common spiritual activities like generosity, kindness, respect, then when I feel safe about that--that you and I are the same in the spiritual aspect--then I can look into our differences and see that you can actually help me out because you are different. You can bring out the different things in me, my uniqueness, which I didn't know before.

I consider the matter of the heart rather than the materialistic view, where we have to come up with different laws--sure, we have to come up with different laws and different material things--but we need to change people's hearts in order to reach that.

Restructuring for Ethnic Peace at the University of Hawai'i

LUCIANO MINERBI

Debating Ethnic Peace at UH

This series of fora organized by the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace provided a platform for direct dialogue among members of the university community on the issues of ethnicity and racism at the University of Hawai'i. The fora addressed the recent controversy precipitated by Larry Laudan, chair of the Philosophy Department, with his request to the UH administration that Haunani-Kay Trask be removed as director of the Center for Hawaiian Studies because of the content of her letter to the editor of *Ka Leo*, written in response to a previous letter by Joey Carter, a philosophy student. A series of exchanges in the local press, radio, and TV were followed by formal investigations of the case by the University Administration, the UH-Mānoa Faculty Senate, and by grievances filed with the Dean of Students by Carter against Haunani-Kay Trask and by students of the Center for Hawaiian Studies against Laudan. The faculty union supported the academic freedom of Professor Trask without necessarily endorsing her views. A divided Faculty Senate tabled the matter. The investigations by Vice President for Academic Affairs Paul Yuen and by Dean of Students Thomas Gething concluded in February 1991 that Trask was not guilty of racial discrimination against Carter. Meanwhile this series of fora indicated that members of the university community are alert and would closely monitor and debate the steps taken by the parties involved and by the UH decision makers on this case.

The purpose of the panel on "The Search for Ethnic Peace" was threefold: (1) to provide a synthesis of the previous panels as seen by the respective moderators; (2) to give an opportunity for a brief response by some participants from differing ethnic and racial backgrounds; and (3) to identify characteristics of ethnic peace and directions for renewed efforts toward a positive intervening climate at UH. Hopefully the Institute for Peace will be able to support additional town-gown fora on ethnicity, racism, and peace-with-justice in Hawai'i. By the time the proceedings of these fora will be

available, the controversy dealing with Trask-Carter-Laudan will have been resolved in favor of academic and personal freedom, by not yielding to the request to punish Professor Trask and in favor of open discussion of the underlining issues.

Academic Freedom Has its Own Characteristics

It should be possible to identify the operating characteristics of academic freedom. The opposing views on academic freedom presented in the first forum on "The University and the Right of Academic Freedom" show that there is no freedom without (Majid Tehranian): (1) responsibility, or a code of conduct (Kenneth Kipnis); (2) social justice and denunciations of colonialism and racism (Haunani-Kay Trask); (3) vigorous public discourse (Kathy Ferguson); and (4) freedom from politically correct speech (Peter Manicas). Because there is some tension between codes of conduct and freedom from politically correct speech, a better process is needed for improving dialogue at the university. Dialogue, as a legitimate and necessary activity, should be added to or integrated with course work and research endeavors. Improved dialogue should facilitate the establishment of a sense of community on campus, concomitant to the pursuit of liberty and equality.

Learning As Empowerment

The forum on "The University's Responsibility Toward Students" reiterated that students should be treated properly and that they are repositories of knowledge and experience which must be heard and feelings which must be expressed. Faculty and university administrators should not take for granted the deep-seated feelings of students about education, ethnic relations, and equality, particularly those of foreign, minority, and women students. There is a great need to express concerns and to listen to each other. Both Mary Tiles and Majid Tehranian have made the point that education is more than a one-way transfer of knowledge. We can move toward a less bureaucratic and bottom-up system of education and learning, so that students feel empowered to develop their intellectual abilities and self-confidence (Mary Tiles). Bureaucratic and legalistic procedures to deal with sexual harassment and racial problems on campus do not necessarily produce changes at the level of personal relations, habits, and attitudes (Mary Tiles). Nonbureaucratic fora for faculty-student dialogue and cross-departmental discussion among faculty can improve communication.

Structural Change And Sensitivity Training for Faculty and Administrators

The power structure at the university is still largely white and male dominated, at odd with the racial, ethnic, and gender makeup of students and staff. In addition to changes in personnel and power base, there is a need to engage the present faculty and administrators in a process of sensitivity training and awareness development regarding gender and ethnic concerns. Barbara Siegel, moderator and panelist of the forum on "UH Policy and Procedures: Affirmative Action and Grievances," concluded that proper administration of affirmative action and grievances for women and minorities encounter unintentional and intentional barriers placed by the majority of white male faculty. This majority often lacks appreciation and understanding of the desire for equal treatment by women and minorities and is condescending in matters of affirmative action, nondiscrimination, and equal opportunity, as well as when it treats an isolated woman or minority person as a "token." Ethnic and gender discrimination induces loss of self-esteem, anger, and frustration in those affected. Fortunately UH has initiated a number of good programs to deal with the basic needs of minorities, women, and nontraditional students for study, work, and support services. However, too many years are required before these programs will be created, fully funded, and improved. A case in point is the Child Care Center, which took about twenty years to become a reality at the university. Siegel reminds us that improvements in female staffing and hiring is still slow. Issues of violence, crime, racism, sexism, and sexual harassment still exist on campus, although there is an evolution from overt hostility to a caretaker mentality. Some perceive that a hostile environment, as a form of aggression, still impacts a large number of women and minorities. A number of women faculty have left the university for better places and less harassment. The Equal Employment Opportunity/ Affirmative Action office is in the untenable position of advising at the same time perspective grievants and those grieved against. The "damage control" and "critic busting" mentality of the bureaucracy is not a progressive response. This third forum concluded that there is a need for immediate action and not simple adjustments to accommodate women and minorities on campus. Action means ensuring recruitment of women and minorities by supporting their successful performances and by safeguarding against harassment and discrimination.

Innovation Initiated From the Bottom-Up

Constructive efforts to ameliorate the study and the conditions of ethnic minorities on campus have usually started from the bottom-up. Participation is then the key to university reform. This is the message of the forum on "The Legacy of Racism and the Role of the University." Franklin Odo reminds us that the movement to establish ethnic studies has been led largely by students, a few faculty, and activists. Odo gives two major practical suggestions for positive actions to achieve ethnic peace:

1. Explicitly support the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. This would not only address justice for Native Hawaiians in its own right, it would also help all local communities better appreciate the merits of administrative decentralization, local autonomy, and self-reliance, which could be extended to each town and locality in the state of Hawai'i. That is, instead of opposing the Hawaiian movement for sovereignty of the ceded lands (now controlled by the state of Hawaii and the Federal government) as taking away something from the rest of us, we could see the establishment of Hawaiian sovereignty as a first step to extending government decentralization and more home rule also to small towns such as Kailua and Wai'anae.

2. Encourage each and every institution in the state of Hawai'i to address the issue of ethnic peace for itself, within its very own organizational structure. Unions, military, the legislature, banks, media, public agencies, churches, and so on would talk to their members and staff. Each university unit would have facility personnel, staff, faculty, students, chairs, and deans engaged in such a dialogue. This dialogue could be initiated simultaneously in a decentralized bottom-up way in many work places--a feasible undertaking.

Colonialism and a Warlike Mentality Still Pervasive

Colonialism is not simply an aberration of previous generations, it continues today through its own institutional inertia and in society's power structure. Donald Topping, moderator of the forum on "The Legacy of Colonialism and the Role of the University," notes that colonialism still haunts us in job discrimination, the use of native lands, and imperialistic wars in the Third World. At the university, colonialism comes across in attitudes expressed through forms of behavior and language in the classroom and in the daily work of the university. There are also belligerent societal attitudes and beliefs, so that our leaders couch

everything in terms of war (war on poverty, crime, drugs, illiteracy, etc.). Topping suggests, on the one side, tempering accusatory stances, and on the other, meeting legitimate demands of Hawaiians and locals. He then expands on Lili Kame'eleihiwa's suggestions, worth restating in brief: Learn Hawaiian history and culture, support Hawaiian studies, have a working knowledge of the Hawaiian language, study something of the culture of all Hawai'i's peoples, support ethnic programs, interact better with people in the Pacific, and expose colonial attitudes.

These suggestions are reasonable because they call for improving biculturalism among the people in Hawai'i (learning to become bicultural) by better understanding Hawai'i's history and contemporary situation. The University of Hawai'i and the State Department of Education can have a greater role in reaching a broader audience in teaching Hawaiian culture and language. There are a number of good videos covering Hawaiian culture, such as those made by Nā Maka o ka 'Āina. These videos should be more readily available on all TV channels.

Sharing Ideas and Experiences a First Step to Mutual Understanding

The forum on "Class, Ethnic Identity, Culture, and Education in Hawai'i" enabled many people to share ideas with each others in small groups, a first step in the quest for ethnic peace. The moderator was Ron Cambra. Part of the discussion revealed differing viewpoints regarding pidgin (Hawaiian Creole English) and its proper role in Hawaii as a marker of class, ethnic, and local identity (Charlene Sato). Pidgin not only has a role, its use has political, cultural, and symbolic value. Although there is disagreement about whether or not pidgin should be used in the classroom, it should be possible to come up with circumstances where its use is desirable. Anyway faculty and administrators should take Hawaiian Creole English if they are serious about cultural diversity and if they recognize the legitimacy of indigenous languages and cultures. They will feel more at home in Hawai'i.

But the problem is not simply one of improving individual attitudes and biculturalism. More permanent improvement can be achieved in higher education only when staffing reflects the diversity of the community, via increased affirmative action (James Harpstrite), and in lower education when funding is increased for rural areas so as to broaden the students' career horizons with

adequate counseling (Davianna McGregor). There is a need for diversity in education to reflect different cultural backgrounds, recognizing urban and rural concerns and their ethnic connotation, such as Hawaiian roots in rural areas (Davianna McGregor). New ways to involve families in educational tasks must also be found. The bottom line is to empower the local community, particularly the Hawaiian community. My conclusion is that there is a lack of proper planning focused on sustainable development which is community based, locality by locality, rather than the statewide orientation toward relentless economic growth.

This sixth forum noted that it is difficult to identify oneself in a multicultural environment such as Hawai'i; that some locals operate in a time warp compared to their old homeland customs; and that they are under pressure to acculturate through the reward/punishment system of the American mainstream, including in matters of religion. This is when ethnicity and religion (Wally Ryan Kuroiwa) become even more important, when people are confronted with the prospect of losing them (Jon Matusoka). Ethnicity remains a dynamic and evolving concept that people must experience, live freely, and redefine.

Many Requests By Hawaiians Good and Legitimate

The historical loss of health, religion, culture, mores, language, land, and sovereignty by Hawaiian has been massive but not total. A proud past can chart the future for a Hawaiian renaissance, because much of Hawaiian culture is still here. The University of Hawai'i has a responsibility toward Hawaiian students. 'Alohilani Kuala summed up well how UH-Mānoa can help in a programmatic way: (1) educate all students in Hawaiian history, culture, and language; (2) educate faculty and administrators in the same; and (3) implement affirmative action for minority faculty and students. Kuala identifies suitable models in the federally funded programs at Texas A & I University and at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Let us seriously study these programs and, if suitable, strongly encourage UH-Mānoa to adapt them on campus.

Immigrants Benefit from Knowing Hawai'i's History and Their Rights

In addition to sensitizing the dominant majority to becoming more bicultural, there is a need to help new groups better appreciate

their new home in Hawai'i. Sheila Forman indicated two programs that can help recent immigrants adjust and cope:

1. Begin an educational campaign to reach potential victims of discrimination because of foreign appearance and accent and inform them of their rights.
2. Inform immigrants and refugees about Native Hawaiian issues and other local issues, so that they better understand the place where they live.

The second project in particular could do much, not only to lessen friction between locals and newcomers, but to help newcomers begin to understand and support the just rights of the indigenous people of the Hawaiian islands.

Cultural Tolerance Possible When One Feels Safe

A learning process must take place in the individual to change one's heart, learn ethnic tolerance, and be able to appreciate the beauty of diversity among people. Fariba discussed how people are initially afraid of cultural differences, how they need to feel safe before they can look at differences in others, and how they can incorporate somebody else's thinking without having to give up their own views, but instead accentuating them.

Looking to the Spirituality of Others Encourages Cultural Appreciation

Fariba's Baha'i faith encourages her to look at the spirituality of other people, and in that way learn to appreciate others. This suggestion is of great value: instead of focusing on differences, such as religious differences, which may be strange to us, we can learn to appreciate "the oneness of spirituality among everybody."

A very good approach to appreciate someone else's culture is precisely to study their values and belief system as the basis of their behavior. Peace education can study how different ethnic cultures deal with human values and virtues common to mankind. In my own study of "Native Hawaiian Sanctuaries and Places of Refuge" and in my discussion with Native Hawaiians, I have been trying to sort out (1) which are the unique, basic Hawaiian religious and philosophical beliefs; (2) which values are pertinent to individual and personal growth (virtues and inner attitudes); (3) which are collective values of *'ohana* and of group activities; and (4) what are the paramount values that cut across all three. This knowledge is useful in the design of more culturally compatible programs and in self-reliant community development. Different Hawaiian groups

and organizations in fact identify certain key Hawaiian values, such as *'ohana, lōkāhi, kōkua,* and so on, as the driving forces behind their programs and activities.

Racism a Multifaceted Scourge

Steve Ito clarifies the fact that racism exists in many forms: individual and institutional; covert and overt; intentional and unintentional. He reminds us that racism is perceived in others, never in ourselves. We should acknowledge ourselves to be recovering racists, admit the problem, and work for a solution. This goes for the reformed racist and the victim.

Personal Stories of Racism Must be Told and Heard

The feeling and emotions of people and the values of others and ourselves must be vented and considered. The peacemaking process must allow for the expression of individual and collective concerns about racism. Listening to personal histories of women and minorities helps to understand another's situation. The paper by Kathryn Takara shows that minority students are exploited when they are recruited because of their athletic abilities and are not helped and encouraged by faculty to learn and achieve, so that they fall through the cracks. That is why there is a need for ethnic mentors to help high-school students.

Biculturalism Can Be Pursued in Teaching, Research, and Service

The quest for a nonlocal faculty to become a little more bicultural and relate better to the local culture can be addressed in teaching, research, and service.

1. At the personal level, a faculty member can engage in empathy and solidarity with minorities and indigenous people. This requires embracing, jumping into the other culture, even if some aspects of it are not yet understood or shared.
2. At the professional level there are opportunities to learn some aspects of other cultures, lifestyles, and needs in general or even better in the specific discipline or field of work of the faculty.
3. If one has some personal awareness and an understanding of how his or her own field of study affects the culture and the people in question, it is not difficult to help them, even politically, in some of what they want to achieve. In practice a faculty member could:

- involve students in class projects dealing with meaningful grass roots issues;
- facilitate networking among local ethnic groups;
- support some of the claims that native and local people have, support them at least in principle, if more knowledge is needed to support them in detail; and
- follow legislative efforts of concern to local people.

This effort can be very rewarding and can give nonlocal faculty some roots in the community and some purpose in teaching at this university.

APPENDIXES

The papers in this volume are the result of a series of events during the academic year 1990-91 at the University of Hawai'i, which eventually led to the seven forums at which these papers were originally presented. The following three appendixes are included in order to help readers better understand the references in many of these papers to specific people and events on the University of Hawai'i campus. The material in these appendixes was collected by Tom Brislin, associate professor of journalism at the University of Hawai'i, and his student assistant Jamie Asao.

I. A Chronology of Events

September 5, 1990. A column by Mr. Joey Carter, undergraduate student in philosophy at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, "Being Haole in Hawaii," is printed in the Open Forum of the *Ka Leo o Hawai'i*, the campus newspaper.

September 19, 1990. In reply a column by Professor Haunani-Kay Trask, director of the University's Center for Hawaiian Studies, "Caucasians are haoles," appears in the same forum.

Beginning from late September, opinion columns, open forums, and letters to the editor appear in *Ka Leo* and the two main community newspapers (listed in Appendix 3).

October 5, 1990: Joey Carter withdraws from UH and shortly thereafter returns to the mainland.

October 17, 1990: The University's philosophy department unanimously agrees to a resolution, A Statement on Racism in Academe, which is printed in the *Ka Leo* Open Forum of October 26. In a cover letter accompanying the resolution, sent to UH Vice President for Academic Affairs Paul Yuen, Philosophy Department Chair Larry Laudan requests that Professor Trask be removed as director of the Center for Hawaiian Studies.

November 2: In a letter to Professor Laudan, University of Hawaii President Dr. Albert J. Simone writes that administrators may not speak for the university without appropriate consultation with senior officers of the university.

November 4, 1990: The Board of the Faculty Union, the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly, approves two resolutions affirming academic freedom at the university and asserting that department chairs and center directors are not administrators but faculty, whose speech is protected.

November 14, 1990: President Simone sends a memo to UH deans and directors, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and the president and executive director of the UHPA, asking Vice President Yuen to prepare a report and recommendation on the appropriate exercise of the rights and privilege of academic freedom and freedom of speech at UH, and the sanctions to be imposed when this boundary has been crossed. The memo also notes that the Faculty Senate had received a complaint from the philosophy department, and that President Simone was withholding judgment on the controversy until he received the reports from Yuen and the senate.

November 26, 1991: Joey Carter returns and files a grievance with UH Dean of Students Thomas Gething against Professor Trask for discrimination and creating a hostile environment

December 5, 1991: The Committee on Professional Matters of the Faculty Senate reports to the Senate Executive Committee that it declines to investigate the philosophy department complaint because of a lack of investigative procedures. The committee includes both a majority report that finds Professor Trask's remarks inappropriate and a minority report that finds harassment charges against her to be unjustified.

December 6 and 7, 1990: *Ka Leo* surveys show students feel Professor Trask is within her rights, but criticize her style.

December 12, 1990: Five students file a discrimination complaint with Dean Gething against Professor Laudan for creating an "intimidating, anti-Hawaiian atmosphere."

December 19, 1990: The Faculty Senate defers action and votes to table and send two resolutions back to the Committee on Professional Matters, whose chairman, Professor of Physics and Astronomy Victor Stenger, had resigned the previous week, after his committee was prevented from offering its own resolution.

January 30, 1991. *Ka Leo* reports white supremacist stickers, some labeled "Haunani Trash," are found on campus.

As the institute forums began, two investigations--by Vice President Yuen at the request of President Simone and by Dean Gething of Joey Carter's grievance--had concluded that Professor Trask's actions did not merit reprimand; the investigation by the Faculty Senate was tabled in committee, and the grievance filed by the five graduate students against Professor Laudan was still pending.

2. Original Documents

The three seminal documents referred to by several papers in this collection are reprinted here. These articles first appeared as items in the Open Forum column of the *Ka Leo o Hawaii*, the campus newspaper of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. We are grateful to *Ka Leo* for permission to reprint them here.

"Being Haole in Hawai'i," by Joey Carter
Reprinted from *Ka Leo o Hawai'i*, September 9, 1990

Am I a haole? Am I even a Caucasian? I'm not sure, maybe you can help me out. I always get confused about these abstract categories.

We've all heard of the "Japanese-bashing" that's been in the news lately, but there's another kind of blind stereotyping that's growing almost unrestrained--Caucasian-bashing.

"Good!" you might think. But since I'm classified as a Caucasian, I feel obligated to explore this issue and defend myself, the individual. So let's step back a bit and see what's going on here.

The fight to prevent racial prejudice is imperative. The need to understand and eliminate racism is a must, especially today. The

recent focus on racism (which has never actually left us) shows our concern and frustrations and need for a change in the way minorities are manipulated, ignored and suppressed.

Supposedly, I belong to a group of people who, for millennia, has repressed, persecuted, dominated and wholly conspired against nearly everyone who was not a part of my white race.

My haole brothers and I are arrogant, selfish, aggressive, insensitive, Godless, well-off, rednecked or skinheaded. We consider ourselves superior to everyone else on the planet--because we're white, right?

There are some problems here, though. It's true that I'm often a jerk and somewhat self-centered, but at the same time I've at least occasionally had some good thoughts and performed some helpful acts. Millions of other whites do much more--for a variety of races. What are we, a failure to our own race?

In Waianae, Kalihi and Waikiki I've been chased and beaten by groups of locals who have been taught that I am the cause of their problems, taught to hate or fear my skin, hair and eye colors. I am the foreigner, the changer of things, the dominator. Even my friends, who are mostly local, say things like, "You're a pretty good guy for a, you know, haole."

You may be thinking, "It's about time you folks got a taste of your own medicine." And you will be racist in your thought. Racism is not an exclusively white endeavor.

Many locals consider mainlanders (mostly whites) to be aggressive and negative; many mainlanders consider locals to be passive and lazy. In actuality, it's relative to what each is used to.

What does "racial discrimination" mean? It means being able to separate differences in our recent racial background--*discriminating* racially. There isn't anything negative implied here. Discrimination itself is not the problem (although the word has taken on new meanings). How we use this ability is up to us, to embrace differences or to reject differences.

No two groups of people are exactly alike; no *two people* are exactly alike! Whether the distinction is male-female, black-white, local-non-local, European-Asian-African-Arab, we can be prejudiced.

We can create an us-against-them situation even with next door neighbors, Little League teams, short people-tall people, etc. We can be prejudiced about anything if we choose to be.

How accurate can one judge another person using only his race, his skin color, his hair color, the shape of his eyes, his heritage?

What about one's social status, education, religion, culture, sub-culture, gender, nationality, tribe, philosophy, language, interests, skills, talents or government? These are all ways that we've grouped each other in the past.

To judge people, to trust or distrust people--*whole groups of people*--by some abstract physical characteristics, is incredibly ridiculous. Besides, what is "race" anyway?

"Whites" also have different roots and backgrounds and sub-cultures, which have been conquered, destroyed, changed and forgotten. The world is a changing place. No one can take away our heritage, but we all must change.

In recent newspaper articles and editorials, there have been references to our "haole-dominated" society and "puppet-haole governments." These are racist remarks.

Why blame the whole white race, if such a group exists? And since over 70 percent of the population of the United States is considered Caucasians, odds are that in a democratic society such as ours, the ways of the majority will dominate.

Can we intelligently say that our problem is due to *one race* (and sex) dominating others, or could it be the political persuasion--not race--or the religious persuasion--not race--or the socio-economic status--not race? People are *complex individuals*.

I grew up in Louisiana. The word "haole" is used very much like the word "nigger" was used then. Just as whites call themselves haoles, blacks called themselves niggers. Both terms are generally derogatory and stereotyped, yet they are used casually. By using these terms, considering the baggage that is carried with them, parents, peers, politicians, and teachers teach children racist attitudes.

As a unique person who has a unique background and unique ideas and opinions, I, too, often find myself as part of the minority in situations--yet I am a so-called Caucasian. How many racial minorities fall into the majority of other categories? If we step back a little from our assumptions, maybe we'll stop bashing each other so much.

So, am I a "haole"? Are you a "local"? Are you a "black?" Are you an "Oriental?" We can classify ourselves however we choose to--but it still won't be us. We're so silly sometimes. I am who I am; you are who you are.

"Caucasians are haoles," by Haunani-Kay Trask
Reprinted from *Ka Leo o Hawai'i*, September 19, 1990

Mr. Joey Carter's dilemma of whether or not he is a "haole" can easily be answered. If he is white or "Caucasian" (as he prefers), then he certainly is haole.

This word is one of the few surviving Hawaiian language descriptions in common use in Hawaii. And it has survived despite official suppression of my Native Hawaiian language by an all-haole, English-speaking American government in 1900.

Indeed, Mr. Carter follows in the footsteps of his American haole compatriots who came to Hawaii in the 19th century demanding that Hawaiians convert to the haole Christian god, follow the haole path of capitalist development, and adopt haole ways of behaving. Now, Mr. Carter demands that we stop using our own description of him in our own land. Too bad, Mr. Carter, you are haole and you always will be.

And this is precisely Mr. Carter's typically white American problem: he wants to pretend that he is outside American history, a history which has made white power and white supremacy the governing norm from the birth of the American colonies to the present American imperium that holds the world as a nuclear hostage.

Mr. Carter is a privileged member of American society because he is haole, whether he acknowledges his privilege or not. His very presence in Hawaii, and before that in Louisiana, is a luxury provided him through centuries of white conquest that visited genocide on American Indians, slavery on Africans, peonage on Asians, and dispossession of Native Hawaiians.

Hawaii is presently a colony of the United States, not because we Hawaiians chose that status, but because the American government overthrew our Hawaiian government in 1893, and forcibly annexed our islands in 1898. With the overthrow, things Hawaiian were outlawed and things haole American were imposed.

As an American in Hawaii, Mr. Carter is benefitting from stolen goods. Part of that benefit is the moral blindness of the settler who insists on his "individuality" when his very presence has nothing to do with his "individuality" and everything to do with his historical position as a member of a white imperialist country. Mr. Carter could examine his own presence here, and how things haole, including the English language, the political and economic systems, and the non-self-governing status of native Hawaiians allows him to

live and work in my country when so many of my own people have been driven out.

Of course, Mr. Carter needs to know, before he learns about Hawaiians, that in the long and bloody march of American history, only African-Americans were classed as 3/5 of a person in the American Constitution, that noble document of democracy. He should also learn that only Asians were beaten and killed because they were the "yellow peril," only Japanese were interned in concentration camps because they were Japanese, only American Indians were "removed" and "terminated" as a people because they were Indian.

In fact, Mr. Carter does not understand racism at all, another common characteristic of white people. For racism is a system of power in which one racially-identified group dominates and exploits another racially-identified group for the advantage of the dominating group. People of color in America don't have enough power to dominate and exploit white people. That's what the so-called "founding fathers" of the United States intended, and that's how American society operates today. But Mr. Carter hasn't noticed this reality.

The hatred and fear people of color have of white people is based on that ugly history Mr. Carter is pretending an "individual" exemption from, and which he refuses to acknowledge. It is for self-protection and in self-defense that we people of color feel hostility towards haoles.

Contrary to what Mr. Carter believes, this hostility is not "haole-bashing;" it is a smart political sense honed by our deep historical wounding at the hands of the haole. On the rare occasions that we feel something other than hostility, something like trust or friendship for a certain haole, it is because we have made an exception for them. It is our privilege, and not Mr. Carter's privilege, to make exceptions, and to make them one by one. For it would be the mark of extreme historical stupidity to trust all haoles.

In his uninformed, childish bemoaning, Mr. Carter flaunts his willful ignorance of where he is (in my native country, Hawaii), and who he is (a haole American). Of course, his statements are disingenuous. If Mr. Carter does not like being called a haole, he can return to Louisiana. Hawaiians would certainly benefit from one less haole in our land. In fact, United Airlines has dozens of flights to the U.S. continent every day, Mr. Carter. Why don't you take one?

"A Statement on Racism in Academe,"
by the Faculty of the Philosophy Department
Reprinted from *Ka Leo o Hawai'i*, October 26, 1990

The faculty of the Department of Philosophy has been saddened to learn that one of our undergraduate majors, Joey Carter, has withdrawn from the University of Hawaii. Having been assaulted because of his race, Joey had written in Ka Leo (Sept. 5) about social conditions here in Hawaii.

In a reply published two weeks later, Professor Haunani-Kay Trask rejected Joey's opinions as "uninformed, childish bemoaning." "Contrary to what Mr. Carter believes, this hostility [that we people of color feel towards haoles] is not 'haole-bashing;' it is a smart political sense honed by our deep historical wounding at the hands of the haole." Pointing out that many airplane flights leave Hawaii each day, Professor Trask urged Joey Carter to take one.

Had a white professor anywhere in the United States declared black students to be unwelcome, had he encouraged hostility against blacks and proposed that they return to Africa, this would be condemned as racist. Professor Trask contends that because racism is a system of power, only those in power can be racists. But professors and university administrators plainly have power over undergraduates. While she may not have meant it, Professor Trask's language may quite naturally be understood as condoning violence against a member of the university community solely because of his social identity and opinions. And even had Professor Trask not appreciated those implications, she would, as an administrator and as a professor of this University, still be guilty of a naivete far more culpable than that of which she accuses Joey Carter.

Following her article, Joey Carter, feeling increasingly threatened by attempts to trace him through Ka Leo left our program and returned to the Mainland for this and among other personal reasons.

The Philosophy Department cannot take lightly the loss of one of our students. Nor can we tolerate the remarks of Professor Trask and the climate of intimidation to which they have contributed. The central mission of a university is to provide a setting within which scholars and students can pursue intellectual excellence. Accordingly, all faculty and administrators have a special duty to protect and sustain the fragile atmosphere within which ideas can be

assessed on their merits. Professor Trask, as a faculty member and as a University administrator, has betrayed this most basic professional responsibility. As with sexual harassment, racial harassment is a serious offense against the ideals of the university.

3. Print Media References

For the benefit of readers who may wish to explore further some of the issues raised in this volume, or in particular to gauge the range of community response, this appendix contains a list of references in the major Honolulu print media to the controversy that ultimately led to this work. The list begins with the Open Forum by Joey Carter and covers the next five months, up to the date of the first forum. The primary sources included here are the *Honolulu Advertiser*, the *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, and *Ka Leo o Hawai'i*.

9-5-90: *Ka Leo*, Open Forum. "Being Haole in Hawaii," by Joey Carter

9-19-90: *Ka Leo*, Open Forum, "Caucasians are haoles," by Haunani-Kay Trask.

9-21-90: *Ka Leo*, Open Forum, "Taking Trask to task," by Grant Crowell

9-26-90: *Ka Leo*, letters to the editor

9-27-90: *Ka Leo*, letter to the editor

10-9-90: *Ka Leo*, "Is Ka Leo the voice of racism ?," letter by Haunani-Kay Trask

Ka Leo, letters to the editor

10-24-90: *Ka Leo*, letter to the editor

10-26-90: *Advertiser*, "Racial dispute erupts at UH-Manoa"

Ka Leo, Open Forum, "A Statement on Racism in Academe", by the faculty of the philosophy department, UH-Mānoa

10-27-90: *Advertiser*, "Racism debate splinters UH faculty"

Star Bulletin, "Reprimand favored for Trask in UH flap"

10-28-90: *Advertiser*, "Go Home Haole!" cartoon by Dick Adair

11-1-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask to speak at campus rally"

11-3-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask invites philosophy chairman to leave Hawaii"

Star Bulletin, "Supporters of Trask rally on campus"

11-5-90: *Star Bulletin*, letters to the editor
Ka Leo, "Racist issue comes to a head at rally"
11-6-90: *Star Bulletin*, "Faculty union backs Trask in UH dispute"
11-7-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask's right to speak out backed"
11-8-90: *Ka Leo*, "Administration responds to Trask"
11-9-90: *Advertiser*, "Simone orders Trask probe"
Star Bulletin, "Peace Week rally turns to issue of native rights"
Star Bulletin, letters to the editor
11-9-90: *Ka Leo*, "Trask challenges Simone to a debate"
Ka Leo, "Philosophers need help," column by Jeff Tobin
Ka Leo, letters to the editor
11-10-90: *Advertiser*, letters to the editor
11-12-90: *Star Bulletin*, letters to the editor
11-14-90: *Ka Leo*, letters to the editor
Midweek, "Academic Freedom Isn't Always Absolute," column by Larry Price
11-15-90: *Ka Leo*, letter to the editor
11-16-90: *Advertiser*, "Mounting a challenge to 'haole dominance,'" by Haunani-Kay Trask
Advertiser, "Responsibilities limit her speech freedom," by Mary Tiles, Jim Tiles, Thomas E. Jackson, and Ron Bontekoe of the philosophy department
Advertiser, letters to the editor
Star Bulletin, letters to the editor
Ka Leo, "Administration clashes with Union"
11-19-90: *Star Bulletin*, letters to the editor
Ka Leo, letters to the editor
Ka Leo, "Students Speak Out," interview column
11-21-90: *Ka Leo*, "Probe of Trask delayed"
Ka Leo, "UH is still White Male U.," column by Jeff Tobin
Ka Leo, "Does Laudan lack consistency?" Editorial Note
Ka Leo, letters to the editor
11-23-90: *Advertiser*, letters to the editor
Star Bulletin, "What Do You Think" (interviews with people on the street)
Star Bulletin, letters to the editor

11-26-90: *Star Bulletin*, "Trask words whip free-speech whirl"
11-27-90: *Advertiser*, "Getting political," feature interview of Haunani-Kay Trask by Beverly Creamer
Star Bulletin, "Student charges Simone wants his critics silenced"
Ka Leo, letters to the editor
11-28-90: *Ka Leo*, Open Forum, "The historical context of *haole* need be examined," by David T. Takeuchi
Ka Leo, letter to the editor
11-29-90: *Star Bulletin*, letters to the editor
11-30-90: *Star-Bulletin*, "Mock student trial convicts UH head Simone in absentia"
Ka Leo, letter to the editor

12-1-90: *Star Bulletin*, letters to the editor
12-4-90: *Kapi'o* (Kapiolani Community College student newspaper), "Trask--a leader with the right stuff," by Paula F. Gillingham; "Grow Up, Haunani! Racism is Racism," by Ken Komoto
12-5-90: *Star Bulletin*, "7,000-member native group places its weight behind Trask"
12-6-90: *Ka Leo*, "Students feel that Trask has her academic rights"
12-7-90: *Star Bulletin*, "UH student files charge against Trask"
Star Bulletin, Richard Borreca's Capitol View: Cayetano addresses racism
Ka Leo, "Students do not like Trask's style"
Advertiser, "Trask target of grievance by student she criticized"
12-8-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask case heats up again"
12-10-90: *Ka Leo*, Open Forum, "Philosophy professor stands firm," by Richard Farr
Midweek, "Is Trask Worth So Much Media Attention," column by Bob Jones
12-12-90: *Star Bulletin*, "Youth who fired race row 'loves' isles"
Star Bulletin, letter to the editor
Ka Leo, "Trask investigated by three offices"
Ka Leo, Open Forum, "Don't silence Trask," by Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa
Ka Leo, letters to the editor
12-13-90: *Advertiser*, letter to the editor
Star Bulletin, letter to the editor

12-14-90: *Star Bulletin*, Trask backed by UH Ethnic Studies faculty
12-15-90: *Star Bulletin*, letters to the editor
12-16-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask right to speak out is defended"
12-17-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask receives support from far-flung groups"
12-18-90: *Star Bulletin*, A. A. Smyser's Hawaii's World: Carter hopes racial debate turns positive
12-20-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask case ties UH faculty into knots"
Star Bulletin, "UH faculty defers action on Trask"
12-22-90: *Advertiser*, "Trask backers file complaint"
Star Bulletin, "5 Trask students lodge complaints at her critic"
Star Bulletin, letter to the editor
12-24-90: *Star Bulletin*, letters to the editor
12-29-90: *Advertiser*, "UH may not be taking Trask to task"
12-31-90: *Star Bulletin*, "Trask controversy" (year recap)

1-1-91: *Star Bulletin*, "Haunani-Kay Trask" (10 most notable people of the year)
1-3-91: *Star Bulletin*, letter to the editor
1-5-91: *Star Bulletin*, letter to the editor
1-8-91: *Star Bulletin*, "Rx prescribed for racist 'disease' infecting U.S."
1-24-91: *Ka Leo*, "Students allege discrimination"
1-25-91: *Ka Leo*, letter to the editor
1-28-91: *Ka Leo*, letter to the editor
1-30-91: *Ka Leo*, "Racist logos found"

2-3-91: *Advertiser*, "Simone Q and A," interview with UH President Albert J. Simone

The Center for Hawaiian Studies presents its overall view of the issue in the winter 1990-91 issue of its newsletter, *Lei o ka Lanakila*, which includes "Racism, Cowardice, and Liberalism: On the Current Crisis at Mānoa," by David E. Stannard, reprints of the *Ka Leo* open forum by Joey Carter, "Being Haole in Hawai'i," and the reply by Haunani-Kay Trask, "Caucasians are haoles," and statements by the Hawaiian Studies Faculty of the University of Hawai'i at Hilo and by Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa.

Forum Participants

RON CAMBRA is professor and chairman of the speech department.

DORIS CHING is vice president for student affairs.

JOSH COOPER is vice president of the Associated Students of the University of Hawai'i.

KISHORE DASH is president of the East-West Center's Participants Association.

KALEIMOMI'OLANI DECKER is a member of *Make'e Pono Lāhui Hawai'i*.

LARENE DESPAIN is an associate professor of English.

EMANUEL J. DRECHSEL is adviser to the liberal studies program.

FARIDEH FARHI is an associate professor of political science.

KATHY E. FERGUSON is an associate professor of political science and women's studies.

SHEILA FORMAN is the executive director of the Catholic Immigration Center in Honolulu.

DAVID WELCHMAN GEGEO is a graduate student in political science.

JAMES HARPSTRITE is curriculum developer for the Curriculum Research Development Group.

MANFRED HENNINGSEN is professor of political science.

SUSAN HIPPENSTEELE is a graduate student in psychology.

STEVEN ITO is associate conference minister of the Hawai'i Conference of the United Church of Christ.

NORMAN JACKSON is conference minister and general secretary of the Hawai'i Conference of the United Church of Christ.

LILIKALĀ KAME'ELEIHIWA is an assistant professor of Hawaiian studies.

NOEL JACOB KENT is an associate professor of ethnic studies.

KENNETH KIPNIS is a professor of philosophy.

'ALOHILANI KUALA is a member of *Make'e Pono Lāhui Hawai'i*.

WALLY RYAN KUROIWA is the senior pastor of the Nu'uanu Congregational Church.

NANCY LEWIS is an associate professor of geography.

JUANITA LIU is a professor in the School of Business.

DAVIANNA MCGREGOR is an assistant professor of ethnic studies.

PETER MANICAS is director of the liberal studies program.

JON MATSUOKA is an assistant professor in the School of Social Work.

LUCIANO MINERBI is a professor of urban and regional planning.

FRANKLIN ODO is professor and director of the ethnic studies program.

FARIBA PIROOZMANDI is a graduate student in public health.

CHARLENE SATO is an assistant professor of English as a second language.

MIMI SHARMA is the director of the Center for South Asian Studies.

BARBARA SIEGEL is a professor of public health science.

DAVID STANNARD is a professor of American studies.

KATHRYN WADDELL TAKARA is a lecturer in the ethnic studies program.

MAJID TEHRANIAN is a professor of communication and director of the Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace.

MARY TILES is an associate professor of philosophy.

DONALD M. TOPPING is a professor of linguistics and director of the Social Science Research Institute.

MIE WATANABE is University of Hawai'i Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action officer.

ROBERT WISOTZKEY is president of the Graduate Student Organization of the University of Hawai'i.

Publications of the Matsunaga Institute for Peace

The Matsunaga Institute for Peace publishes scholarly and creative works on peace in all media. The publications are available from the institute (Matsunaga Institute for Peace, University of Hawai'i, Porteus Hall 717, 2424 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hawai'i, USA 96822; 808-956-7718, FAX 808-956-5708).

Solving Conflicts: A Peace Research Perspective, by Johan Galtung. In conjunction with the University of Hawaii Press. 1989. 62 pp. $8.

Peace and Development in the Pacific, by Johan Galtung. In conjunction with the University of Hawaii Press. 1989. 68 pp. $8.

Nonviolence and Israel/Palestine, by Johan Galtung. In conjunction with the University of Hawaii Press. 1989. 79 pp. $10.

Peace Studies: The Evolution of Peace Research and Peace Education, by Carolyn Stephenson. Occasional Paper 1. 1990. 19 pp. $2.

War and Children's Survival, by George Kent. Occasional Paper 2. 1990. 33 pp. $2.

Letters from Jerusalem, edited by Majid Tehranian. Occasional Paper 4. 1990. 87 pp. $4.

Engulfed in War: Just War and the Persian Gulf, edited by Brien Hallett. 119 pp. Fall 1991.

Implementing the Rights of Children in Armed Conflict, by George Kent. Working Paper 1. 20 pp. Fall 1991.

In addition, the Institute distributes the following publications from the Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project of the University of Hawai'i:

Nonviolence and Hawaii's Spiritual Traditions, edited by Glenn D. Paige and Sarah Gilliatt. 1991. 112 pp. $5.

Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving, edited by Glenn D. Paige and Sarah Gilliatt. 1991. 176 pp. $10.